A HOUSE DIVIDED:
PARTITION IN CYPRUS AND IRELAND

Julia Jacovides

Advised by Melanie Tanielian

Submitted to the University of Michigan
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

BACHELOR OF ARTS WITH HONORS

Department of History

April 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

To my father, for introducing me to Cyprus, for staying out of my hair while I wrote this, and for always inspiring me to be more.

To my mother, who knows me better than I know myself, for showing me it's never too late to start doing what you love.

To my sister, my role model and mentor, for making her stories about saints and sinners, heroes and heroines, and doctors and patients come alive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The past came to visit again last night,
wrapped her arms round my neck
and whispered: It's me. Don't forget.

I knocked at a door which a woman opened.
She said in Turkish: Come in. Welcome.
Hoş geldiniz. Hoş geldiniz.

She handed an album of photos of me,
my husband, our children, this house,
pre-1974. The blue album. My living room.

I kept these for you, she said.
I thanked her in Greek. Efcharisto poli.
A tiny space the size of a pinhead

between each word stung the air, the moment,
the dream. She offered coffee and sweets.
One of us was guest, the other hostess- but which?

Oh, there are some dreams which make no sense.
Turn over the cup, she said. I will tell you
your fortune, and we will learn the future.

Yes, I said, yes. We leant like two friends over a secret
and the patterns of the future on the walls of the cup,
made us weep on each other's shoulders

all those thirty year old tears, finally, belatedly;
two sisters who were mothers, wives, daughters,
so long ago. Then the past came and sat between us

and woke me with a whisper:
It's me. Don't forget.

"Don't Forget" by Nora Nadjarian in Hanne (2004)

Introduction

Partition leaves a mark. It may not be visible, but it is always there. I noticed it when I was twelve and traveled to the north of Cyprus for the first time. In the passenger seat next to my father sat his first wife, Katia. For me, this was a day trip to visit monasteries. For them, it was a return to the family land they had lost when Turkish troops landed on the island in 1974. That day, the reality of partition struck me forcefully as I began comparing the north and south. Geographically, they were part of the same island. Culturally, economically, and politically, they could not have been more different. The north, governed by Turkish Cypriot authorities, was significantly less developed than the south. It had smaller buildings and more open spaces; for the most part, it was rural. The south, in contrast, had streets crowded with cars and trucks, tourist areas targeting English and Russian visitors. That day, though, what interested me the most were not these physical variations. Rather, it was the surprising emergence of bitterness in Katia, as she struggled to reconcile the north of 1974 with the north of 2004. She was emotional, equally entranced and repelled by the state of her old home. My father, who has not lived in Cyprus since 1956, was comparatively relaxed and optimistic. Katia's resentment shocked me, and I tried to figure out why I had not noticed it earlier. Partition had left its mark and I hadn't even noticed.

Cyprus, a tiny idyllic island in the southeastern corner of the Mediterranean, has been partitioned for forty years. Yet, current political dialogues addressing violence in the region tend to neglect this country and its division. It is difficult to determine whether the geographical or political size of the island has caused this disappearance, for

1

it was not always this way. Over the centuries, Venetians, Egyptians, Ottomans, and British forces conquered the island. They each claimed it for strategic purposes: Cyprus's location makes it a perfect steppingstone between the Middle East and Europe. After Britain lost India in 1947, its reliance on Cyprus grew: the island acted as a bridge between the regions, and ensured the British continued access to oil. For many centuries, two ethnic groups comprised a majority of the island's inhabitants. By 1960, Turkish Cypriots accounted for a little less than twenty percent of the population, and Greek Cypriots represented the other approximately eighty percent. As a result of the anti-colonial movement of the 1950s, Greek Cypriots began agitating for union with Greece (*enosis*) while Turkish Cypriots started pushing for partition between Greece and Turkey (*taksim*). In 1960, both movements failed when the United Kingdom granted Cyprus its independence. Yet, from the start, the new country had difficulty exercising its sovereignty. Greek and Turkish nationalists in Cyprus spent the next fourteen years agitating their respective populations. Their efforts would ultimately bring an end to the power-sharing agreement set up by Cyprus's first constitution.

For Greece and Turkey – almost seven hundred miles away and forty miles away, respectively – Cyprus's demographics in 1960 provided substantial proof that they were responsible for the welfare of their ethnic brothers and sisters on the island.[1] After independence, in large part because of Greek and Turkish efforts, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots maintained their ethnic identities, and failed to become simply Cypriot. The detrimental effects of this dichotomy emerged in December 1963 *(Kanli Noel)*. That month, the Greek Cypriot President Archbishop Makarios (1913-1977) published a list of

---

[1] Greece defended Greek Cypriots because the island was ethnically Greek; Turkey defended Turkish Cypriots because, as the minority, they needed protection.

thirteen amendments to the constitution.[2] Turkish Cypriots panicked. To them, these

changes represented yet another attempt on the part of the majority Greek population to

restrict Turkish rights and opportunities. A few days before Christmas, inter communal

violence broke out in the capital city of Nicosia. To this day, Turkish and Greek Cypriots

dispute the initial source of disagreement. Following the violence, Turkish Cypriots

moved into enclaves, which Greek Cypriots quickly blockaded. Within a month, the

power-sharing community envisaged by the 1960 constitution had fallen apart. Each

group grew increasingly distinct from the other, both politically and physically. The next

decade was a tense standoff between communal, neighboring, and international leaders.

Turkish Cypriots periodically returned to their enclaves, Greek Cypriots ruled the

government unilaterally, and the United Nations (UN) stepped in as peacemaker. In July

1974, well-known *enosis* hit man Nikos Sampson (1935-2001) led a coup against

President Makarios. The Archbishop fled, but lived, and the coup lasted for only a

handful of days before Turkish troops retaliated by invading the island. It quickly

became apparent to the American government that the colonels in Greece's military

government had sponsored Sampson's *enosis* venture. Cyprus's constitution included a

clause allowing for Turkish, Greek, or English intervention in Cypriot affairs should the

status quo be disrupted. Turkey's first invasion of July 20, then, was legal.[3] However,

on August 14, it commenced a second invasion that completely violated Cypriot law.

Turkish forces pushed south until they occupied approximately thirty-seven percent of

the country. The UN brokered ceasefires in both July and August 1974, but a massive

---

[2] Makarios served as Cyprus's first president from 1960 until 1977.
[3] Over the past decade Turkey's periodic threats to invade Cyprus coincided with Greek
actions against the Turkish Cypriots. The United States led frantic negotiations that
prevented full-out war until 1974.

population displacement occurred as Turks moved north and Greeks south. To this day, the UN's border remains in effect, and runs the width of the island. Over the past forty years, periodic communal talks have broken down over various issues, and plans for reconciliation have failed at the political level. As Cypriot division has largely vanished from global political dialogues, Cypriots such as Katia continue to live with the daily realities of partition.

In the following thesis I will revisit the issue of Cyprus's split by looking at it alongside division in Ireland. My research examines each state at three points on its path to partition: before, during, and after. I argue both partitions resulted from international interference (before), that they both led to massive migrations (during), and that British policies encouraged division along ethnic and religious lines (after). Traditionally, academics view Cypriot division as the product of two factors: competing nationalisms and foreign involvement. They frequently overlook the serious impact that massive displacement and physical division have on communities in the years that follow. I argue that these deserve to be treated as importantly as the larger political and economic concerns, and that diplomats must realize how slowly partitioned communities forget. All too often politicians suggest partitioning a state currently undergoing violence or civil war. Cyprus's experience is worthy enough to lead a discussion on why this needs to end. The country has been in the news lately for its economic troubles, and the implications of its recent trials spread far beyond its borders. As a member of the European Union (EU) it has a certain level of influence in European politics. However, it has also historically enjoyed partnerships with Russia, Syria, and Lebanon. It has yet to take full advantage of its position as the geographical and cultural middle ground

between these two regions. If Cyprus resolves its partition – either by a two-state agreement or some alternative – it can focus on connecting the cultures to its east and west.

In the traditional academic literature, partition is an absurd policy. Foreign powers implement it in an attempt to secure their regional interests, often to the detriment of local populations. Radha Kumar, an expert on ethnic conflicts, suggests that external forces, particularly colonial powers, offer partition as part of their "divide and quit" policy; this ensures that they can extract themselves quickly from the violence. She criticizes this method and points out that the argument for partition (it will circumvent future conflict) is inherently flawed. No division based on ethnicity has ever been reversed. Both Kumar and sociologist Robert Schaeffer treat Cypriot partition alongside their discussions on division in Ireland, India, and Palestine. All four countries have split along ethnic or religious lines, rather than political ones. However, the Cyprus case, conflict specialist James Ker-Lindsay points out, is unique. Cold War ideologies influenced its domestic politics before partition, when President Makarios decided to take the non-aligned path in his dealings with Soviet and American governments. In the end, though, the country's split along ethnic lines offers some insight into the strengths of nationalist ideologies. Academics like Michael Attalides and Halil Ibrahim Salih have emphasized the role of Greek and Turkish nationalisms in Cyprus's partition. Cyprus's unusual position – as the site of both an ethnically driven division and Cold War politics – makes it an interesting case study of partition.

In Cyprus, memories of the initial division remain vivid to those who experienced it. Yet, the traditional literature avoids these recollections in favor of a highly rational

analysis of competing nationalisms or external interference. Moreover, analyses of the Cyprus problem arrive highly politicized. Greek Cypriot authors discuss the partition in clear-cut terms, while Turkish Cypriots tend to be more emotional and nationalistic. Both sides claim to be the victim. More importantly, no text views the two regions in Cyprus as part of the same state. The traditional Greek narrative views the northern territory, but neither its people nor its culture, as legal property of the Republic. Turkish Cypriots, meanwhile, view the island as divided between two equally lawful states. Texts that diverge from the traditional framework are rare, but their number has grown substantially over the past ten years. Christalla Yakinthou, a political scientist, concludes that the 1960 constitution's power-sharing provisions, not competing nationalisms, prevented island-wide unity. Anthropologist Rebecca Bryant's interviews with Turkish Cypriots allow us access to the forty-year old memories of an emotional and turbulent period. As the Turkish invasion grows ever more remote, it becomes increasingly important to collect and report these personal memories of Cypriot partition. Working off of interviews by Bryant and her colleague Olga Demetriou I have compiled both the rational and emotional aspects of Cypriot partition. The result is an anthropological and historical view of a frozen conflict that is just as much personal as it is political.

This project approaches partition from a new angle. Instead of solely focusing on one aspect of partition, I look at three: international interference, mass displacement, and the type of division. Instead of considering only one or a handful of communities, I focus on how two very different partitioned regions interact with these aspects, and each other. By contrasting these two communities (although focusing primarily on Cyprus), I argue that the effects of partition in each are relatively identical. Partition as a policy never

truly changes the landscape, and it never actually resolves inter communal tensions. In

my research I worked with texts from a variety of fields: historical, sociological, and

anthropological. I explored the archives of two Irish newspapers, the *Irish Times* and

Irish Independent, in an effort to understand how their reporters viewed Cypriot

independence, violence, and partition. I accessed declassified government documents at

the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor and the UN Archives in New York.

The Ford Library offers insight into American reactions to Turkey's invasion and

occupation; documents from the UN detail the organization's commitment to maintaining

peace on Cyprus. Both provide an extraordinary glimpse into the backroom politics that

characterize the Cyprus conflict. Unfortunately, the diplomatic language of each

prevents a complete understanding of what motivated foreign powers to get involved in

Cyprus. Despite this, though, documents from the Ford Library help support my claims

about American interests in Cyprus, and reports from UN officials in Cyprus help

characterize the situation on the ground.

Telling the story of Cypriot partition can be highly problematic. Not only does

the terminology remain highly charged – "invasion" for Greeks, "intervention" for Turks

– but the statistics vary. Despite the conflict's absence from many political agendas, it

remains a controversial topic for historians. To remedy some of the misconceptions, I

will be in conversation with three works in particular as they highlight the rationales and

trauma behind partition. Robert Schaeffer's book *Warpaths* forms the theoretical

foundation. He addresses why policymakers might resort to partition so often. It can,

they argue, create a homogeneous society, avert a civil war, satisfy independence

movements, and secure superpower interests in the region. However, Schaeffer also

points out the policy's limitations through brief case studies of Ireland, the Vietnams, the Koreas, Cyprus, Pakistan/India/Bangladesh, and Palestine/Israel. It is, Schaeffer argues, impossible to create a homogeneous society. Moreover, in any state, minorities will be disenfranchised and poorly treated, and other international powers will not always accept a new state's sovereignty. The risk for conflict with neighboring states, he argues, increases substantially following partition. Others agree with Schaeffer's general claims, but some disagree with his specifics. Douglas Little, a historian, feels that long-term disagreements between Greeks and Turks had a greater impact on Cyprus's partition than did big power politics. Moreover, he suggests that partitions themselves are not the reasons that many divided countries remain troublesome today. Despite these issues, three of Schaeffer's observations about the nature of partition form the backbone of each chapter: big power politics (Chapter One), mass displacement (Chapter Two), and ethnic and political division (Chapter Three). His work offers a comprehensive view of the similarities between partitioned countries and, in doing so, highlights the absurdity of continuing to use partition as a peacemaker.

To grapple with the emotional impact of partition that Schaeffer and other authors like Yakinthou and Kumar ignore, I introduce Rebecca Bryant's ethnographic study with displaced Turkish Cypriots. *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Strife* allows us unprecedented access to the experiences of Turkish Cypriots displaced between 1955 and 1974. Bryant's colleague, Olga Demetriou, conducted a similar study with Greek Cypriots displaced during the 1974 war. The two works differ dramatically as a result of their subjects. Rebecca Bryant's findings paint a difficult picture of Turkish Cypriots' experiences as a marginalized community in the enclaves

from 1963-1974. Demetriou's work, meanwhile, describes a Greek Cypriot population largely oblivious to the trials of Turkish Cypriots during that period. Each emphasizes the profound sense of loss that both communities experienced as a result of Turkey's invasions. When discussing partition, it is tempting to clearly demarcate right and wrong, good and bad. Demetriou and Bryant clearly illustrate that, at least for Cyprus, there is no such clarity. Their interviews add life to the field of partition research, for they force readers to think beyond politics.

Ireland's partition appears in this project as a supplement to that in Cyprus: I explore what this other frozen conflict can tell us about Cypriot division and partition in general. Frank Delaney's novel *Ireland* helped me do this. It is, admittedly, an unusual selection, but I would argue that fiction is the best vehicle to understanding something as complex and difficult as partition. By creating a microcosm of the real world, novels are capable of making a big problem comprehensible, manageable, and perhaps even solvable. Delaney traces the journeys of an Irish storyteller as he roams about the island, mixing myths and history to villagers in the 1960s. The Storyteller makes the past accessible and recognizable in part because his characters are driven by the same forces that drive his listeners: curiosity, love, duty, and artistry. Through his words, the past comes alive. The Statutes of Kilkenny, the arrival of the English, the Easter Rising; they are all almost mythical tales that the Storyteller makes tangible. Delaney himself is a powerful and entrancing narrator, capable of illustrating the turbulence and majesty of centuries of Irish history through his short stories. In Ireland, he muses, the past exists with the present. His passionate and respectful portrayal of Irish partition is, in many ways, a fictionalized version of the ethnographies by Demetriou and Bryant. Like them,

Delaney successfully makes Irish partition a very personal matter. Although I do not use the novel as an historical source, I do use it as an emotional one. In the midst of researching forgotten partitions like Ireland and Cyprus, Delaney's work is a powerful reminder that partitioned communities forget slowly.

The "Cyprus problem" is a general term, one that only alludes at the murky situation on the idyllic Mediterranean island. In reality, it encompasses a host of issues in desperate need of resolution. Partition sundered the country in two and a great deal of blame continues to circulate because of it. Katia's reaction when we visited the North is simply one example; the fact that many Greek Cypriots refer to the north as the "occupied territories," and not the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus," is another. It is easy to understand why the Cyprus problem has largely been forgotten. But, at a time when inter communal violence threatens to tear some regions apart, Cyprus needs to be brought to the forefront of the discussion. It must serve as a warning for what happens when states are partitioned. More than that, it must serve as an example of what resolution can look like.

Chapter 1: The Role of International Interference

Despite the difficulties associated with developing a model for partition, every divided community does, in fact, share the same basic characteristics. Partition is, at its heart, a local matter. One of the commonalities we see in the twentieth century's major divisions, though, is a great deal of international interference.[4] From Ireland to Korea to Cyprus, foreign powers intruded and manipulated. Their publicly proclaimed reasons for doing so ranged from preventing a future war (post-1945 Germany) to ending a current one (1990s Bosnia). This trend continues today amidst mentions of partition in Syria. The United States, Russia, and others attempt to legitimize their presence at peace talks by suggesting they primarily intend to end sectarian strife.[5] Realistically, though, these great powers involve themselves in such politically complex situations to secure national interests in the region. Foreign powers that have intervened in Cyprus and Ireland clearly display this split between public rhetoric ("humanitarian interference") and underlying geopolitical motivations. In this section, therefore, I explore the history of foreign interference in Ireland and Cyprus. While the particulars vary – for instance, England colonized Cyprus but not Ireland – the overall effects display significant similarities.

Foreign involvement in partitions has historically required a great deal of delicacy on the part of external powers. Publicly, officials represent such interference as an act of benevolence towards the country in question; privately, they take advantage of the local

---

[4] Robert Schaeffer, *Warpaths: The Politics of Partition* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990), 7.

[5] Jamie Tarabay, "In Syria talks, don't mention the P-word," *Al Jazeera America*, January 23, 2014, accessed January 23, 2014, http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/1/22/in-syria-talks-donatmentiontheaypaword.html.

political chaos inherent in partitioned communities. Colonial relationships differ slightly in that they are less duplicitous, but the end results are the same. In Ireland, the nature of foreign interference was not explicitly colonial. However, British authorities treated the island in much the same way they did Cyprus, several centuries later. Over the past five hundred years, Ireland has been an English colony in all but name. This ambiguity has resulted in a thorny relationship that vacillates between the oppression and cultivation of Irish culture, economy, and society. In pre-independent Cyprus, Ottoman (1571-1878) and British (1878-1960) rulers unabashedly manipulated the local culture and economy, as well. In the years following Cyprus's independence in 1960, though, duplicitous foreign agendas evolved, and began to complicate the new state's sovereignty. As during the colonial era, external actors' own policy goals motivated their involvement, though they now claimed to be motivated by humanitarian interests. In the end, the geo-political goals of other states severely undercut local autonomy and encouraged partition. Although colonialism (as in Cyprus) and direct foreign interference (as in Ireland) share many similarities, they differ a great deal in attitudes towards the local populations. Nevertheless, as will be shown below, both Cyprus and Ireland bear the marks of decades of schizophrenic and overbearing policies on the part of outside powers.[6] The ramifications of such behavior take decades to fully appear, but in the end they always stunt local autonomy and cultivate regional bitterness.

Over the past century, the nature of international interference has changed with the founding of the United Nations (UN) and other similar developments in international law. The UN seeks to build, through arbitration, global consensus. It claims, therefore,

---

[6] Franz L. Neumann, "Soviet Policy in Germany," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 263 (May 1949): 165, accessed March 28, 2014.

to possess a certain objectivity that individual states simply cannot retain. Moreover, it has historically attempted to provide divided states with alternate paths towards peace. The UN's structure ideally inhibits it from intervening solely to further a member state's national interests. Decisions to interfere must be made by the Security Council, comprised of fifteen geographically, economically, and culturally distinct states. However, the veto power held by the Council's five permanent members means that opportunities do exist for a particular member state or its allies to drive the UN's operations. Moreover, the organization's charter prohibits it from becoming involved in domestic matters, which explains why the UN has sent a peacekeeping force to Cyprus but not Ireland.[7] (Northern Ireland is considered a part of the United Kingdom, and a UN peacekeeping force would violate this principle.) However, Irish troops have participated in UN peacekeeping forces, most notably for our purposes to Cyprus. On one hand, the organization's involvement in the Cyprus problem represents a successful interference: there has been no outright war on the island since 1974. Yet, the persistent existence of a foreign body in Cyprus serves as a visible reminder that the opposing sides have not yet reconciled. As Ireland and Cyprus demonstrate all too clearly, foreign interference in domestic affairs – whether through colonial, nationalistic, or humanitarian efforts – has detrimental effects.

Ireland

The English never colonized Ireland. Yet, English policies restricted Irish autonomy and stifled Irish nationalism in much the same way a colonizer would behave

---

[7] Istvan Pogany, "Could the UN Keep the Peace in Northern Ireland?," *The World Today* 37 (July-August 1981): 293, accessed March 4, 2014, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395493

to the colonized. Foreign interference by this would-be colonial power lacked the absolute control of the English in Cyprus, but it was equally damaging. Since the 1171 Norman invasion under Henry II (1133-1189), national self-interest has driven English policy in Ireland, with little regard to what happens to the island's Irish inhabitants. In Cyprus, as we will see below, England appeared alternatively as a friend and foe, its motives frequently hidden under the guise of solidarity. No such uncertainty existed in Ireland. For nearly a millennium, the English ruled with overwhelmingly oppressive policies that simultaneously favored Protestants over Catholics and suppressed local autonomy. The two countries have been caught up in conflict for so long, and their histories have grown so entwined, that it has become difficult to discuss foreign interference in the traditional matter. Particularly in times of war, external interference is typically a short and concerted effort to maximize control over a specific piece of territory. Yet the English have dabbled in Ireland for centuries, sometimes vigorously and sometimes halfheartedly. They never formally colonized, but they refused to retreat. This ambiguity makes it difficult to understand how much English policy has influenced Irish economy, culture, and everyday life.[8]

With the Tudor monarchs, English policy in Ireland reached a turning point, and took on a distinctly colonial appearance. After Henry VIII (1491-1547) broke with the Catholic Church, he introduced Protestantism to Ireland. He even went so far as to settle Protestants on the island, hoping that this would push the Catholic majority into submission.[9] Over the next four centuries, England's grip on Ireland's population grew

---

[88] T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin, editors, *The Course of Irish History* (Cork: Mercier Press, 2011), 122.
[9] Ibid., 164.

through its manipulation of these well-placed Protestant communities. Though many newly converted Irish Protestants chafed against the colonial ambitions of the English monarch, they recognized their precariousness as a religious minority, and willingly submitted to foreign rule.[10] The Act of Union, signed in 1801, legally bound together England and Ireland, and shifted the sectarian balance in Ireland. The Irish Protestant minority now constituted part of the region's religious majority, whereas the previous Catholic majority in Ireland represented now the religious minority. Though Ireland remained legally its own country, heavy English control stifled surges of nationalism that threatened to break apart the union, and call into question English authority in regions across the globe.

The "Time of Troubles" – a euphemism for the Anglo-Irish war between 1919 and 1921 – ended the 120-year old union. But, as the predominantly unionist northern provinces chose to remain under English rule, Ireland split in two. The post-war border became a serious point of contention, and for the next seventy years, Ireland essentially remained at war with England.[11] In many ways, this new chapter of conflict devastated Irish communities more than the preceding centuries of English rule. It divided families and pitted neighbors against one another in a bitter conflict that was as much about politics as it was about religion. Continued foreign interference restricted and stifled the very peace efforts they meant to institute, in the process revealing just how much damage the English had done.

Only in the 1990s did peace in Ireland become a more pronounced goal for the English and Irish governments, as well as the international community. Both English and

---

[10] Ibid., 188.
[11] Ibid., 276.

Irish officials expressed their desire for a resolution: the conflict had gone on for too long, and had perpetuated a culture of religious discrimination and economic instability in Northern Ireland. American president Bill Clinton even dispatched former senator George Mitchell in 1995 to Ireland to help negotiate a settlement. Mitchell reported back his shock at first seeing a "Peace Line," which separated Belfast's Protestant and Catholic communities.[12] Standing thirty feet tall, and topped with barbed wire at parts, he noted the irony of the construct's name. Since the 1921 agreement, Northern Ireland had struggled to recuperate from centuries of foreign rule. The English had cultivated a culture of separation in which Protestants and Catholics viewed each other with mistrust and misgivings long before partition. Northern Ireland combined the two groups into one state, and the preexisting political and religious rifts soon became a serious hurdle to lasting peace. In many ways, then, Ireland has been partitioned twice: between the north and south, and between Protestants and Catholics in the north. The stark religious division exemplified by the Peace Line suggests the difficulties of this, and the murkiness that resulted from centuries of external interference in Ireland.

Foreign and Irish leaderships produced the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, their latest effort to negotiate a settlement between Ireland's warring sections. The Agreement covered a range of issues, including self-determination, equality, and the establishment of a North-South council.[13] Yet, it could not undo the effects of partition quite so easily. For most of Ireland's history, England has been the sole intervening power, and religion the primary divisor. Though never a colony, the English behaved as they did elsewhere in their empire, and restricted development of local autonomy. Unlike in Cyprus, though,

---

[12] Ibid., 341.
[13] Ibid., 344.

the British attempted to merge the two populations, to convert Irish Catholics to Protestantism. Their overwhelming failure to do so reflects England's larger failure to successfully dominate Ireland. In general, it may be said that other foreign powers have, historically, stayed out of the Anglo-Irish relationship. Until the twentieth century, this can be attributed to the geographical proximity of the two islands, as well as England's position as the global power. Following the Second World War, though, the Cold War divided the world into two opposing poles; control over Ireland simply became less important. This does not mean, though, that the situation is any less precarious or delicate than that in Cyprus,. Partition still rendered Ireland in two, and the effects of British influence persist.

Cyprus

In the past 2,000 years, the entire island of Cyprus has enjoyed sovereignty only once, between 1960 and 1974. As a result, scholars such as Christopher Hitchens have argued that Cyprus has a "history of subordination."[14] Its strategic placement – as a steppingstone between the Middle East, North Africa, and Europe – has long ensured its importance in Mediterranean politics, and its oil reserves continue to make the island (and its surrounding waters) a desirable piece of real estate. This section traces the history of foreign interference on the island starting with Ottoman conquest in the sixteenth century and ending with Turkey's invasion in 1974. This long legacy of colonial rule and foreign interference in the island's domestic politics shaped the specific features of Cyprus's partition. Ottoman rule forged ethnic divisions, and British colonization cemented them. Both empires oversaw the rise of nationalist movements, which encouraged future interferences by non-colonial powers such as Greece, the

---

[14] Christopher Hitchens, *Cyprus* (London: Quarter Books Limited, 1984), 31.

Republic of Turkey, and the UN.[15] In effect, it is possible to reconstruct pre-1974

Cypriot history simply by recounting the actions of foreign actors.

Turkey

In its attempts to justify its 1974 interference, the Turkish government reaches

back to 1571, when Ottoman Muslims first settled on Cyprus.[16] Officials in the 1970s

claimed that the descendants of this settled population deserved protection from the

Greek Cypriot majority, which had settled on Cyprus long before the Ottomans. Ottoman

policy dictated that the new residents retain the practices and organizational structures of

the empire, rather than integrate into the Greek population. Moreover, the sultan allowed

Greek Cypriots to develop their own institutions, such as the Greek Orthodox Church.

As Ottoman subjects, Turkish Cypriots technically did not require similar communal

structures. This bound them to a far-away ruler and culture, and prevented them from

breaking away from the Ottoman fold. Such a separation of ethno-religious groups was

to be expected under Ottoman rule, which organized society around the millet system.

Christian communities governed their own internal affairs, but paid a special head tax

(the *jizya*) to Ottoman authorities. This administrative division perpetuated communal

division. In the long run, both delayed the maturation of Turkish Cypriot leadership, and

accelerated Greek Cypriots' sense of autonomy. Quite simply, Ottoman rule prevented

Muslim and Christian Cypriots from becoming solely Cypriot.

---

[15] The Treaties of Guarantee and Establishment, addressed later in this section, allowed foreign forces to remain on the island and intervene with force if the status quo was disrupted. Ironically, this goes against the UN Charter, in which intervention in a foreign state's affairs is prohibited (Ambassador Andreas Jacovides (Former Cypriot Ambassador to the United States, Germany, and United Nations) in discussion with the author, August 16, 2013.)

[16] Brigadier Francis Henn, *A Business of Some Heat: The United Nations Force in Cyprus Before and During the 1974 Turkish Invasion* (Great Britain: Pen & Sword Books Ltd, 2004), 6.

In 1821, Greece began agitating for Cyprus's inclusion as "part of 'Mother Hellas.'"[17] This spurred the development of a new political ideology that would, over time, come to be known as *enosis*: union with Greece. In this early incarnation, leaders of the Greek Orthodox Church encouraged Greek Cypriots to rediscover their Greek heritage, and to push back against Ottoman authority.[18] Meanwhile, the Turkish Muslims remained bound to the Ottoman sultan, for neither he nor his religion deemed it acceptable to assert any similar degree of nationalism. Turkish Cypriots' failure to develop their own brand of nationalism until the mid-twentieth century divided both groups "into separate communities [and] prevented the formation of an institution within which they could lay the foundation of a cohesive national consciousness."[19] Simultaneously, then, while the Greek Cypriot community grew ever distinct, assertive, and pro-*enosis*, the Turkish Cypriots continued to look toward the unrelenting sultan as the island's legitimate ruler. The Ottomans' administrative tactics in Cyprus and its cultural similarities with the Turkish Cypriots left a strong mark even after Ottoman rule ended. The Republic of Turkey emerged in 1922, under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who governed with hyper-nationalist tendencies. The new government quickly found in the Turkish population of Cyprus an ethnic ally that could, with assistance, defend Turkey against Greece's encroachment in the southeastern Mediterranean. Over the next several decades, Muslim Cypriots formulated their own distinct Turkish-inspired brand of nationalism. Where the Greek Cypriots had reached out to Greece, Turkish Cypriots turned to the new Turkish Republic for emotional and financial support. To a

---

[17] Halil Ibrahim Salih, *Cyprus: The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1978), 5.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.

certain extent, British officials encouraged this sentiment. It is, after all, easier to rule an island divided by competing ideologies than one united by anti-colonialist sentiment.

Turkey invaded Cyprus in July 1974. At that time, it became apparent that the Turkish leadership continued to work within the same Turkish nationalist frame it had used for fifty years. Despite the fourteen years of independence, Turkish authorities still identified Turkish Cypriots as compatriots who deserved physical and financial support against the *enosis* movement. Supporting the Turkish Cypriots, however, constituted only a part of the story. Turkey's interference was part of a larger plan to prevent a Greek stronghold in the eastern Mediterranean. Turkey landed troops on Cyprus less than a week after supporters of the *enosis* movement had launched a coup against President Makarios.[20] Publicly, the mission intended to return the island's balance of power to that laid out by the 1960 constitution.[21] Before that summer, Turkey had typically refrained from military action in Cyprus, even when Greeks targeted Turkish Cypriot communities.[22] Its direct involvement in 1974, then, suggests the state viewed itself as the Turkish Cypriots' sole defender, and this coup as a grievous insult to state sovereignty. Moreover, it illustrates that the island continued to play the role of proxy in another tense standoff between Greece and Turkey. After all, if Greece had led a successful coup in the Eastern Mediterranean, then Turkey's western borders were at risk

---

[20] Memo, Cyprus Situation Report #13, 20 July 1974, folder: Cyprus Crisis (8), box 7, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Gerald R. Ford Library.
[21] Ibid.
[22] In 1964 the Greek Cypriot National Guard and its Greek Army contingents attacked the Turkish Cypriot enclave of Kokkina/Erenköy. In response, the Turkish army bombed military and civilian targets until a ceasefire was called. (Rebecca Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Strife. Report Two. Life Stories: Turkish Cypriot Community* (Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), 2012), 54, accessed March 13, 2014, http://www.prio-cyprus-displacement.net/images/users/1/Report%202-%20R.BRYANT%20ENG-WEB.pdf.)

for attack. Political reasons, rather than humanitarian ones, prompted the invasion.

Turkey had retained the Ottoman-era's colonial policies, and its continued patronage of

the Turkish Cypriots kept the island's major populations separate. By landing forces on

Cyprus in July 1974, Turkey both publicly demonstrated its support for the Turkish

Cypriots, and defied Greek expansionist measures.

United Kingdom

British policy in Cyprus reflected Britain's attempts to maintain its influence in

the Eastern Mediterranean. Following the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), Cyprus

became a protectorate of Great Britain. Later, in the aftermath of the First World War,

Britain formally annexed the island. For the next forty years it relied on Cyprus's prime

location to ensure access to Middle Eastern oil and political developments. Anthony

Eden, Prime Minister in the 1950s, stated: "No Cyprus, no certain facilities to protect our

supply of oil. No oil, unemployment and hunger in Britain. It is as simple as that."[23] For

the British, loss of complete control over Cyprus spelled doom. When Cypriots began

agitating for independence in the 1950s, British officials responded with "draconian

measures" in an attempt to cling to their island base.[24] They also worked hard to

downplay the threat posed by the Cypriot independence movement. During a June 1955,

cabinet meeting, Prime Minister Eden portrayed discord on Cyprus as the outgrowth of

Greco-Turkish problems, rather than as a purely anti-colonial struggle.[25] Truthfully, the

independence movement was significantly divided between Turkish Cypriots, who feared

a Greek Cypriot-led government, and pro-*enosis* fighters, who wanted Cyprus to be

---

[23] Brendan O'Malley and Ian Craig, *The Cyprus Conspiracy* (London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 1999), 7.
[24] Ibid., 26.
[25] Ibid., 19.

Greek. The moderates prevailed during peace talks in London and Zurich between 1959 and 1960. However, by suggesting that Greece and Turkey were responsible for the recent agitation, Eden simplified the situation. This portrayal cost the Cypriot independence movement some bargaining power, for Eden had depicted it as weak and manipulated.

Despite loss of overt political control in 1960, Great Britain continued to maintain a palpable influence over the island. Two agreements formulated in August 1960 cemented its authority in Cyprus. Both significantly undermined the new Cypriot state. The United Kingdom, Cyprus, Turkey, and Greece signed the first, the Treaty of Guarantee; it legalized outside interference should the island's status quo be upset. (Turkey's first invasion in 1974 is technically legal according to this provision.) The second agreement, the Treaty of Establishment, secured Cypriot independence from the United Kingdom.[26] Yet, the document designated two geographical areas, Akrotiri and Dhekelia, as British sovereign military bases. This meant continued British presence on the island. From the very beginning, then, Cyprus's independence treaties weakened the island's sovereignty. As the British Empire dwindled, it held onto anything that would give it continued relevance. Cyprus's documents of independence legalized future British involvement in the region, and they also opened the island up to interference by other states. For the tenuous fourteen years following independence, the threat of foreign interference hung threateningly over Cypriots' heads.

Greece

Greece's involvement in Cyprus grew increasingly belligerent as the twentieth

---

[26] "Treaty No. 5476. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece and Turkey and Cyprus," Greece's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, accessed 30 October 2013, http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/treaty_of_establishment.pdf.

century wore on. As the *enosis* movement grew, Greece's interest in expanding its power

(and creating a "Mother Hellas") developed into outright antagonism. The militant

National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA) touted unionist ideas in Cyprus

during the 1950s independence period, when an independent Cypriot state had not yet

become a reality.[27] A 1967 coup in Greece replaced the monarchy with a military and

expansionist-minded nationalist leadership, and marked the beginning of a regime

dedicated to the same principles as EOKA.[28] Greece's financial and military support of

EOKA meant the party remained a powerful political actor even after Cypriot

independence. In 1967, Greek-backed EOKA leader General George Grivas attacked the

Turkish Cypriot villages of Ayios Theodoros and Kophinou. Before the Turkish army

reacted militarily, the Greeks admitted their hand in the attacks and pulled Grivas from

the island to avoid a full-blown confrontation.[29] By December 1967, Greece had

increased its troops on Cyprus to about ten thousand,[30] despite the fact that the original

constitution allowed only nine hundred and fifty.[31] There is no doubt that Greece

encroached on Cyprus quite early after independence. It legitimized its moves claiming,

like Turkey with the Turkish Cypriots, that Cyprus's historically Greek culture meant it

needed to be part of Greece. By planting officers and troops on Cyprus, Greece was

preparing to take the island by force.

---

[27] Hitchens, *Cyprus*, 38.
[28] Ibid., 65.
[29] Ibid., 65.
[30] "Up to Makarios," *The Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973),* December 3, 1967, B6.
[31] "No. 5712: Greece, Turkey and Cyprus Treaty of Alliance (with Additional Protocols)," UN Peacemaker, accessed February 2, 2014, http://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/CY%20GR%20TR_600816_Treaty%20of%20Alliance%20(with%20additionnal%20protocols).pdf.

The 1974 coup marked Greece's most determined effort to bring Cyprus back under Greek control. Led by EOKA and pro-*enosis* forces on the island, it constituted a tremendous breach of national sovereignty, and a betrayal of the documents of independence. Though it quickly became apparent to American officials that Greece backed the coup, a regular mid-day broadcast in Athens did not mention anything about the uprising.[32] Such silence was suspicious. According to a memo issued by the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) on the day of the coup, "Greek officials continue[d] to claim that they knew nothing about the situation."[33] Cyprus's President Makarios fled the country and coup leader Nikos Sampson formed a new pro-*enosis* government. Greece's silence on the matter confirmed international fears that Cyprus's "sham" independence had simply provided a cover for the weak Athenian military dictatorship to encroach on Cypriot sovereignty.[34] Greece's involvement in the 1974 coup constituted its most galling *enosis* venture yet. It represented a push to annex all territories inhabited by a majority of Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians to the Greek state.[35] Of all the interferences launched by foreign states into Cyprus, Greece's proved the most harmful. Not only did it characterize Greece and *enosis* supporters as power hungry, but it also served as a severe breach of inter communal goodwill on the island. This would have a severely damaging effect on inter communal trust in Cyprus. Most

---

[32] Telegram, American Embassy Nicosia to Secretary of State, 15 July 1974, folder: Cyprus Crisis (3), box 7, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Gerald R. Ford Library.
[33] Memo, Cyprus Situation Report #3, 15 July 1974, folder: Cyprus Crisis (3), box 7, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Gerald R. Ford Library.
[34] O'Malley and Craig, *Cyprus Conspiracy*, 86.
[35] Rebecca Bryant, "An Aesthetics of Self: Moral Remaking and Cypriot Education," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43 (July 2001): 589.

importantly, Greece's breach of the Treaty of Guarantee ruined hopes for quick

reconciliation of Cyprus's already tense inter-ethnic situation.

UNFICYP

In December 1963, four days before Christmas, violence broke out between

Greeks and Turks in the Cypriot capital of Nicosia. Known today as *Kanli Noel*

("Bloody Christmas"), the event proved an important turning point in the Cyprus problem

for three reasons.[36] First, it was the most serious outbreak of violence since

independence. Second, it marked the end of a period in which the power-sharing

constitution might have worked. Third, the violence led to the formation of the United

Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). With the passage of Resolution 186

in March 1964, the Cyprus problem became a concern of the entire international

community. UNFICYP forces originally had a three-month mandate[37] and existed to

"prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and

restoration of law and order and a return to normal working conditions."[38] Resolution

186 limited UNFICYP's powers, and the force has so far failed to bring about a long-

term resolution. (UNFICYP still operates on Cyprus today.) At the same time the UN's

presence cemented and perpetuated international involvement in Cyprus. In the end,

UNFICYP has only created a stable situation, not a peaceful one. Little progress toward

a resolution has been made in the past forty years, and it would seem that the world has

by now largely forgotten about Cyprus's division.

---

[36] Christalla Yakinthou, *Political Settlements in Divided Societies: Consociationalism and Cyprus* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), xiv.

[37] "Letter from U Thant," 7 March 1964, Setting up of the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) 1964-1971, S-0869-0001-01, United Nations Archives.

[38] "Memo from U Thant to Lt. Gen. Prem Singh Gyani," 27 March 1964, General Directions for UNFICYP, Peace-Keeping Operations Files of the Secretary-General U Thant: Cyprus, S-0869-0003-04, United Nations Archives.

The Cyprus problem is a result of internationalization. Its division emerged from the legacies of colonialism and geo-political or nationalist aims that exacerbated tensions fifty years ago. Neither the Ottomans nor the British cultivated a unified Cypriot national identity. Post-independence, divergent Greek and Turkish interests ensured their countries' continued presence in Cypriot life, and poisoned ethnic groups against each other. UNFICYP stepped in at a crucial moment, but it has done little besides refereeing flare-ups as they happen. While international interference is not the sole cause of this problem's persistence, we may say that it has until now prevented peace.

Conclusions

On the surface, the histories of partition in Ireland and Cyprus look very different. However, in both cases a long history of foreign interference, which has taken power from the hands of those whose livelihoods are on the line, contributed to the nature of each partition. Historically, as we have seen, Ireland has dealt primarily with England, whereas a number of powers vied over Cyprus. Moreover, the UN took up the Cyprus issue. Despite the significant differences, the effects were very similar. In both countries, international interference has caused local populations to lose autonomy, to suffer economic and political instability, and to experience an increase in inter communal tensions. In time both Ireland and Cyprus have become frozen conflicts, as the effects of partition continue to dominate everyday life. We will see this clearly in the following chapters.

.

Chapter 2: Everyday Realities of Partition

Although it is important to understand the larger national, regional, and international causes and dynamics of partition, its everyday experience has generally been sidelined in historical scholarship. A number of filmmakers and novelists have addressed the realities of partition and ethnic conflict in Ireland. In particular, the Time of Troubles (roughly 1968-1998) has proven to be a popular subject. In the past ten years alone, eight films have addressed the period: *Breakfast on Pluto* (2005), *Fifty Dead Men Walking* (2008), *Five Minutes of Heaven (2009)*, *Hunger* (2008), *Johnny Was* (2006), *Mickybo and Me* (2004), *Omagh* (2004), *Shadow Dancer* (2012), and *The Wind That Shakes the Barley* (2006). Seamus Heaney, the Nobel Prize winning poet from Northern Ireland, won international acclaim for his sensitive understanding of the country's contemporary struggles. After his death last year, a *New York Times* obituary pointed out that "Mr. Heaney was renowned for work that powerfully evoked the beauty and blood that together have come to define the modern Irish condition."[39] His popularity was, in many ways, due to the conflict at home, and to his ability to make art out of a painful subject. In comparison, the Cyprus problem has received marginal attention. Memoirs of inter communal strife in the 1960s and of invasion in 1974 are rare. Their English translations are even more rare. Films concerning twentieth century Cyprus exist, but they do not gather as large an audience as those that focus on Ireland. There are two possible reasons for this divergence. First, the troubles in Cyprus are a small footnote in

---

[39] Margalit Fox, "Seamus Heaney, Irish Poet of Soil and Strife, Dies at 74," *The New York Times*, August 30, 2013, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/31/arts/seamus-heaney-acclaimed-irish-poet-dies-at-74.html?pagewanted=all.

the history of most western states save Great Britain. As such, films and novels

concerning the conflict do not receive wide attention in American or European media.

Second, the conflict in twentieth century Ireland was protracted, visible, and destructive.

Moreover, the situation remains tense today. In Cyprus, struggle for control over the

island was done through political back channels while Americans, Greeks, Brits, Turks,

and Soviets publically pledged to respect Cypriot sovereignty. Its complexity inhibits a

solid understanding of, or appreciation for, the conflict's artistic opportunities. Scholars

like Rebecca Bryant and Olga Demetriou have begun to tackle some of these issues of

accessibility. In interviews with Greek and Turkish Cypriots, they have successfully

demonstrated the painful feelings of loss that emerged in the wake of independence, inter

communal conflict, and partition. In doing so, they widened the field of historical

scholarship, and opened up Cypriot history to popular culture. This chapter would not be

possible without their works. Here, I explore the everyday realities of partition by

looking in particular at the experience of forced migration, and its effects on memory and

contemporary communal interactions.

Massive migration frequently accompanies partition, whether we consider the

seventeen million who crossed the newly established India-Pakistan border after 1947, or

the nearly three million people who left East Germany for West Germany between 1949

and 1961.[40] Partitions have historically caused thousands, and occasionally millions, of

individuals to leave their land and possessions, sometimes permanently. In my particular

case studies, forced migration was no less devastating. Ireland's partition resulted in the

displacement of twenty-five thousand Catholics from Northern Ireland, and twelve

---

[40] Schaeffer, *Warpaths*, 155.

thousand Protestants from South Ireland between 1920 and 1926.[41] In Cyprus after July 1974, approximately twenty thousand Turkish Cypriots went north, and two-hundred thousand Greek Cypriots headed south.[42] Few remained on the wrong side of the new border.

Policy makers often cite population movements as a necessary prerequisite for creating a homogeneous and peaceful society. They argue that such an artificial process of homogenization will, in the long run, protect minorities, prevent civil war, and satisfy groups clamoring for autonomy.[43] These forced migration policies, though, do not take into account the resulting mental and physical trauma placed on communities and individuals. Instead, national, regional and international actors often treat people as property. In general, forced migrations consequently deprive people of their same basic necessities: "security, shelter, sources of food and water, livelihood, and community support systems."[44] Many often find themselves living in temporary refugee camps or makeshift shelters. Moreover, physical displacement demands an emotional resilience, as those who leave their land "also leave behind their past - their photo albums, the tree that they planted when their first child was born, their homes, their neighbors, their social network."[45] In addition, in many cases we see that an initial physical displacement often

---

[41] Ibid., 154.
[42] Ibid., 244.
[43] Ibid., 3.
[44] Jakob Kellenberger, "The ICRC's response to internal displacement: strengths, challenges and constraints," *International Review of the Red Cross* 91 (2009): 476, accessed September 19, 2013.
[45] Deniz Sert, "Property rights in return and resettlement of internally displaced persons (IDPs): A quantitative and comparative case study" (PhD diss., City University of New York, 2008).

results in years of migratory existence and repeated future displacements.[46] There is no doubt that, more often than not, migration degrades the very people it means to protect.

Displaced persons' temporary settlements are frequently sites of conflict rather than the havens of peace touted by pro-partition officials. Food and water, as well as living space, farmland, and public services (health centers and schools), grow increasingly competitive the longer violence and displacement continue.[47] As the temporary becomes permanent, displaced persons are forced to decide whether or not to stay in an increasingly hostile area, or to pick up and move once again.

Ireland

In the Irish case population displacement occurred in two waves. Following partition in 1921, Protestants moved north and Catholics south. Violence and migration has led to the development of enclaves in Northern Ireland's major cities. While the first wave of displacement is typical of partitioned communities, the second is rather unusual: partition aims to create homogeneous societies and so further internal displacement should be superfluous. However, the continued inter communal turmoil in Northern Ireland has forced many civilians to seek shelter within their ethnic communities. In this project, I focus primarily on migration within the North. Here, displacement and segregation serves as a daily reminder to the local population that their lives are physically and emotionally contained and controlled. As late as 2011, thirteen years after the Good Friday Agreement, local neighborhoods (religiously grouped) used flags to stake out their territory, and to inhibit notions of crossing over and cooperating with the

---

[46] Kellenberger, "The ICRC's response to internal displacement," 476.
[47] Ibid., 483.

other side.[48] In Catholic communities fly the orange, white, and green flags of Ireland;

Union Jacks are prevalent in Protestant areas.[49] In an effort to separate the two

communities, residents have built "peace walls" of "steel, concrete, and barbed wire"

following the outbreak of violence in the late 1960s.[50] The effects of such dividers,

however, are more harmful than helpful. By physically preventing contact, the walls

discourage dialogue and everyday interactions between communities. It is these customs,

not estrangement, that lead to peace. Despite a recent announcement by Northern

Ireland's first minister that all peace walls would be demolished by 2023, most who live

alongside the walls fear that inter communal violence will begin anew once the barriers

are removed.[51] Over the decades, these physical borders have hardened emotional

division as integration becomes increasingly unlikely.

Decades of ongoing tension have led to increasingly polarized attitudes within the

North's major cities. In 2001, Protestants in a Belfast neighborhood stoned and taunted

Catholic students on their way to school. Journalist Marjorie Miller points out that this

"Catholic march to school between police lines, and the efforts of angry Protestants to

---

[48] Lorenz Khazaleh, "Strong feelings, mystical rituals and equivocal messages," trans. Matthew Whiting, University of Oslo, May 25, 2011, accessed March 5, 2014, https://www.uio.no/english/research/interfaculty-research-areas/culcom/news/2005/flags-identity-summary.html

[49] Marjorie Miller, "THE WORLD; A Wall of Fear, Mistrust in Belfast Neighborhood; N. Ireland: Protestants feel marginalized in turf war, but Catholics insist they're the real victims," *Los Angeles Times*, September 7, 2001, accessed March 1, 2014, http://articles.latimes.com/2001/sep/07/news/mn-43015.

[50] Senator Mitchell saw one of these peace walls in the late 1990s in Chapter 1. (Joshua Hammer, "In Northern Ireland, Getting Past the Troubles," *Smithsonian Magazine*, March 2009, accessed March 5, 2014, http://www.smithsonianmag.com/people-places/in-northern-ireland-getting-past-the-troubles-52862004/?page=4.)

[51] Barbara Miller, "Northern Ireland to tear down 'peace walls' by 2023," ABCNews, May 10, 2013, accessed March 5, 2014, http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-05-10/northern-ireland-walls/4680718.

stop the parents and children, is not a fight over integration as it was during the U.S. civil rights movement. It is a fight for separation, and for defining boundaries. It is a turf war between tribes that Protestants fear they are losing."[52] As this is neither a new development nor an isolated incident, it then comes as no surprise that communities would gravitate to the safety of an isolated area. A 1973 report by the Northern Ireland Community Relations Committee found that nearly forty thousand people had left their homes due to threats, intimidation, and outright violence by the opposing religious group.[53] Little has changed over the past forty years: Catholics and Protestants alike continue to live in a climate of perpetual fear. The formation of enclaves should be a method of temporary protection, but in Ireland it has become permanent.

Frank Delaney in his novel *Ireland* makes a striking observation: "In Ireland history never ends."[54] More recently, the principal of a Catholic secondary school in Northern Ireland admitted that, "'We're obsessed with history here.'"[55] In the sixteen years since the Good Friday Agreement, much has changed in Northern Ireland. Belfast, once a symbol of entrenched grievances, "is now a jewel of restored Victorian architecture and trendy boutiques."[56] To a great extent, it has succeeded both in rebuilding and shrugging off loaded religious identities. However, journalist Joshua Hammer noted that, just beneath the surface, old rivalries continue to simmer.

> Brightly painted murals juxtapose images of the late Queen
> Mother and the Ulster Freedom Fighters, a notorious Loyalist
> paramilitary group. Other wall paintings celebrate the Battle

---

[52] Miller, "A Wall of Fear," *Los Angeles Times*.
[53] Christopher Sweeney, "NORTHERN IRELAND: A city of intimidation and fear," *The Globe and Mail*, March 31, 1973.
[54] Frank Delaney, *Ireland: A Novel*, (London: TimeWarner Books, 2004), 412.
[55] Hammer, "In Northern Ireland, Getting Past the Troubles."
[56] Ibid.

of the Boyne, near Belfast, the 1690 victory of Protestant King
William III over Catholic King James II, the deposed monarch
attempting to regain the British throne…Another half mile away,
in the Catholic Ardoyne neighborhood, equally lurid murals,
of IRA hunger strikers, loom over brick row houses where the
armed struggle received wide support.[57]

In Northern Ireland, approximately fifty percent of schoolchildren attend institutions where ninety-five percent or more of the student body practices the same religion.[58] Segregated education leaves a long-term mark. Not only does it instruct students according to different worldviews and ideologies, but it also restricts their employment opportunities after graduation by emphasizing that they are Protestant or Catholic.[59] Peter Robinson, a Unionist leader in Northern Ireland, called his country's current education system as "a benign form of apartheid."[60] Its very nature has maintained and, in some ways, strengthened cultural divisions in Northern Ireland post-1998. Despite the positive language of the Good Friday Agreements – dialogue, tolerance – little progress has been made in the North.[61] History, it would seem, cannot be forgotten. The first step, many argue, is integration and an end to the enclave communities. It will not be easy: the years of violence have left a bloody stain that will

---

[57] It was in Ardoyne in 2001 that Protestants heckled Catholic students on their way to school. (Ibid.)

[58] Kathryn Torney, "The religious divide in Northern Ireland's schools," *The Guardian*, November 24, 2012, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2012/nov/24/religious-divide-northern-ireland-schools.

[59] The economy and religion are closely aligned in Northern Ireland. A British chain store, Dunne's, opened in Belfast in 2003. Its entrance faced a Catholic neighborhood and, as a result, Protestants avoided the store; it went out of business after only five years. (Hammer, "In Northern Ireland, Getting Past the Troubles.")

[60] David Pravett, "Northern Ireland teaches us the dangers of segregated schools," *The Guardian*, November 29, 2011, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2011/nov/29/northern-ireland-segregated-schools-peter-robinson.

[61] Miller, "A Wall of Fear," *Los Angeles Times*.

be hard to remove, and even harder to forgive. Until then, though, there is little hope that displacement and isolation will cease to be an issue.

Cyprus

In the traditional view of modern Cypriot history, the island experienced mass migration for the first time in 1974. Historians have represented this seismic event following the Turkish invasion as a rather simple process. Greeks quickly moved south to avoid the violence and Turks moved north to join their "saviors." Of course, this narrative is far too simple and fails to account for the fact that inter communal violence (or the threat of it) had displaced Turkish Cypriots several times since 1955, when EOKA began to campaign for *enosis*. However, *Kanli Noel* in 1963 represented the first time in post-independence Cyprus that inter communal violence displaced the Turkish Cypriots. That year, Cyprus's attempt to operate under a power-sharing constitution came to an abrupt halt with the publication of President Makarios's "Thirteen Points." This public letter – which ran in a paper controlled by the Greek Communal Chamber in Cyprus – forced the country to decide between upholding colonial-era tensions or foregoing them for some hazy, as-yet-undefined concept of Cypriot unity. It contained thirteen amendments that aimed to foster unity in the new and divisive Cypriot government.[62] Many of his proposals might have streamlined the sluggish and rather incompetent administration. Makarios, for instance, suggested abolishing the veto power of the President and Vice President, as well as the standing requirement for separate communal

---

[62] "Aide-memoires and papers on the Fourteen Points 1964-1964," 1974, Peacekeeping – Cyprus 1964-1971, S-0870-0001-11, United Nations Archives.

majorities in the House of Representatives.[63] He also argued that the election of

President and Vice President of the House of Representatives should not be done on a

communal basis but, rather, by the body as a whole.[64] In addition, and perhaps most

offensive to the Turkish Cypriots, he suggested shifting the current ratios of ethnic

representation in the public service (70 Greeks to 30 Turks), security forces (70:30), and

army (60:40).[65] He ultimately wished "to bring them into line with the ratio of Greeks to

Turks in the population as a whole."[66] After the letter's publication, tensions on the

island rose. After violence broke out in late December, Turkish Cypriot officials in the

Cypriot government refused to work with their Greek Cypriot counterparts. They

claimed that President Makarios intended to establish a Greek dominated-government,

thereby denying Turkish Cypriots the active voice in Cypriot politics that they had long

enjoyed. Approximately twenty-five thousand Turkish Cypriots (about one-fourth of the

island's total population), equal parts appalled and terrified, fled their homes and

congregated in one of seventeen ethnic enclaves.[67] These were often adjacent to the

country's biggest cities, such as the capital Nicosia, which housed twenty thousand

Turkish Cypriots.[68] Over the next decade, these isolated communities' populations

would rise and fall with the perceived level of threat posed by the Greek Cypriots. The

Turkish Cypriot leadership's decision to encourage the formation of ethnic enclaves

---

[63] "Report of the United Nations Mediator on Cyprus to the Secretary General," 26
March 1965, Mr. Galo Plaza's Report, Peacekeeping Cyprus 1960-1971, S-0869-0001-
10, United Nations Archives.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Rebecca Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus*, 7.
[68] Rebecca Bryant and Mete Hatay, "Guns and Guitars: Simulating Sovereignty in a state
of siege," *American Ethnologist* (2011): 634. Accessed July 4, 2013, doi: 10.1111/j.1548-
1425.2011.01327.x.

exacerbated a tense situation. By the time of Turkey's intervention in 1974, Cyprus's

population had been divided for years; partition simply legalized an unsavory reality.

Turkish Cypriots

For many Turkish Cypriots, life in the enclaves provided a sense of protection.

Although heavily militarized, the communities were ethnically homogeneous, and this

offered a break from the steadily intensifying inter communal relations on the island.

When families first started to arrive, they immediately built perimeters demarcating the

enclave's territory. After December 1963, about four thousand Turkish Cypriots who had

worked in the government did not return to their posts.[69] They instead began to govern

the separate enclave communities, and challenged Greek Cypriot claims to authority over

the entire island. Greek officials banned certain imports to and exports from the

enclaves, hoping that this would weaken the Turkish Cypriot leadership and prevent it

from building either international legitimacy or alliances. From December 1963 until

March 1968, in an effort to make life unbearable, the Greek government blockaded the

enclaves.[70] One Turkish Cypriot recalls that, "There was nothing, absolutely nothing, at

the time. Imagine, the Greek Cypriots wouldn't let *anything* into the enclaves – not a nail,

not clothes, not food. We were living on rations from the Red Crescent – dried beans and

dried chickpeas."[71] The Greek blockade also prevented tires, telephones, coal, and

building materials from entering the enclaves. This meant that the displaced Turks could

not build comfortable (or permanent) housing; many lived in tents or insufficient shelters.

---

[69] Democracy and Development Platform Association (DEKAP) and Eastern
Mediterranean University Centre for Strategic Studies (DAÜ-SAM), *Restrictions,
Isolations and Vendettas: The Lot of the Turkish Cypriots Since 1963*, (Lefkosa Mersin
10 Turkey: DEKAP and DAÜ-SAM, 2007), 21
[70] Bryant and Hatay, "Guns and Guitars," 646.
[71] Ibid., 631

Following violence in 1963, villagers in Kokkina/Erenköy were trapped there for the next decade.[72] For the next year, they struggled by on limited rations. Nafiye, a young woman at the time, remembers "They would give a small bread to four people. One little slice of bread, a few olives. We would slice the olives into little pieces…"[73] Finally, in 1965, the Red Crescent provided the community with tents; they lived in these for the next three or four years.[74]

Despite this poverty and isolation, a sense of solidarity emerged within and around the enclave system. As Turkish Cypriots struggled to survive, they also developed a sense of self-sufficiency that strengthened their ethnic identity. Theirs was both a "fight for existence" and one "to exist."[75] Indeed, for many Turkish Cypriots, life in the enclaves served as their ground zero, an opportunity to rebuild society at all levels. They "very quickly re-created within the enclaves all the functions of a 'real' state."[76] This included government offices and bureaucratic practices. In the years leading up to 1974, life in the enclaves became normalized and equalized. One older woman remembers the period fondly: "All the parties we had! We'd wear evening gowns to go to each other's houses. Can you imagine?"[77] As Rebecca Bryant and Mete Hatay (a political analyst) comment, "Such are the stories of the period: deprivation and dances, crowding and concerts, child soldiers and beauty contests."[78] Turkish Cypriot solidarity

---

[72] Kokkina is the Greek name, Erenköy is the Turkish name.
[73] As quoted in Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus*, 56.
[74] Ibid., 57.
[75] Bryant and Hatay, "Guns and Guitars," 640
[76] Ibid.*,* 635.
[77] Ibid., 642.
[78] Ibid.

in this period derived from their isolation, and from their dependence on one another. A

Turkish Cypriot journalist, Ahmet Tolgay, remembers this period with nostalgia.

> If they ask me, "Is there any period of your life to which you
> would want to return?" I would answer without hesitation,
> "The ten-year period between 1964 and 1974." Of course, this
> period covers the most painful years of the Turkish Cypriot
> people's history. But who can claim that beauty can't be created
> out of pain? … What was good and magical was the social
> solidarity that rejected this unjust and unfeeling imprisonment.
> The solidarity was made up of the sort of love, sharing,
> self-denial, tolerance, and heartfelt hope that had not been
> seen in the more than 400 years of Turkish Cypriot history.
> We laughed together, we cried together. Even if they were
> scattered in ghettoes around the island like broken pieces of
> glass, we were like a family that shares everything in those
> days…[79]

During the brief interludes of peace, when Turkish Cypriots ventured beyond the

enclaves' barricades, they "were faced with the humiliating recognition that a prosperous

Greek lifestyle surrounded them on every hand."[80] The Turks' displacement encouraged

the maturation of Turkish Cypriot nationalism, which supported the community through

the tense decade-long standoff with Greek Cypriot forces. However, it also encouraged a

culture of segregation. In 1959, 88 Greek Cypriots and 624 Turkish Cypriots lived in

Malia, a mixed village in the country's southwest. By 1964, the Greek Cypriot

population had swelled to 250, while the number of Turkish Cypriots had shrunk to

281.[81] Over the next decade, this process would be repeated time and again, making it

increasingly difficult to envision an integrated Cyprus.

---

[79] Ibid., 639.
[80] Ibid., 644.
[81] "Summary of Incidents 3 July 1964," 3 July 1964, UNFICYP Headquarters, Nicosia,
Operations Branch – Summary of Incidents 1964-1972, S-0678-0001, United Nations
Archives.

Following the 1974 war, Turkish Cypriots underwent displacement once more. That year, approximately forty-five thousand Turkish Cypriots moved to the north out of fear of retaliation for Turkey's invasion.[82] After the dust settled, Turkish troops occupied just less than forty percent of Cypriot territory, and the Turkish Cypriot leadership established its authority over the northern part of the island. For Ramadan, a child during the invasion, the trip north was long, arduous, and crowded: "I came to the north in a minibus filled with 25 people all on top of each other, through back roads. It was a two-and-a-half hour journey, but it seemed like two-and-a-half months."[83] Technically, the Turkish Cypriot Provisional Government distributed land by lot, but realistically, many Turkish Cypriots "found homes they liked and squatted there."[84] In the years following partition, the new Turkish Cypriot regime allotted land through a system that rewarded those who had fought between 1958 and 1974.[85] In doing so, it perpetuated the guarded and militaristic attitudes that had characterized Turkish Cypriot attitudes for so many decades. After their 1974 movement north, many within the community felt disappointed and dissatisfied with their new situation. Displacement this time was a final blow to the old order. A sense of finality emerged, as did unhappiness with the current situation. A Turkish journalist in 1976 mentioned that this sentiment permeated conversations with Turkish Cypriots he had encountered. "No matter with whom I speak, they sigh, 'Oh, sir, I had such a house, such shops, such properties in the south.' I've seen very few people who were satisfied with what they had received."[86] Öncel, a Turkish Cypriot child during

---

[82] Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus*, 11.
[83] Ibid., 28.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid., 12.
[86] Ibid., 11-12.

the decade of displacement noted that, "his family never fully 'settled' in the north, as they were always anticipating a return to their village."[87] Orhan, another child, recalled to Rebecca Bryant: "It was really hardest for the older people, for instance a man's a farmer and is used to waking up at five every morning and going to his fields, and he comes here to Bellapais [in the north], and what's he supposed to do?"[88] (Nearly seventy-five percent of Turkish Cypriots who were displaced in 1974 lived in rural villages. Their migration meant they lost their sole form of subsistence.[89]) In many ways, the ten-year enclave period gently introduced Turkish Cypriots to the realities of displacement. It was only in 1974 that the community underwent the trauma of displacement. That July, the Turkish invasion was a point of no return, and Turkish Cypriots finally suffered the extent of forced migration's repercussions. For nearly forty years following, they were cut off from the land they had owned for generations and from the fields they had cultivated since childhood. Besides being geographically disorienting, Turkish Cypriots' exile to the north was a blow to their sense of self.

Greek Cypriots

For the Greek Cypriots, the 1974 war was similarly traumatizing in that it cut them off from ancestral land in the north. Unlike Turkish Cypriots, though, the Greeks had no enclave community into which they could withdraw. Instead of the optimistic isolation of the Turkish Cypriots, Greeks remember their movement in 1974 with bittersweet sadness, and a persistent sense that injustice was done. In July of that year, Turkish troops first landed at Kyrenia, a town on the island's northern coast. Reports

---

[87] Ibid., 41.

[88] Ibid., 52.

[89] "Profile of Internal Displacement: Cyprus," Global IDP Database, last modified April 27, 2005, http://www.internal-displacement.org/assets/library/Europe/Cyprus/pdf/Cyprus-April-2005-2.pdf, 36.

from Greek Cypriots in the area paint the attack as "particularly brutal" and they accuse the Turkish army of "employing tactics [intended to] terrorise the civilian population into retreat."[90] Rape, torture, and hostage taking are among the accusations leveled by Greek Cypriots soon after the violence concluded. Many Greeks sought refuge on the British bases before moving on to refugee camps or the major cities. Olga Demetriou, a social anthropologist, conducted a series of interviews with Greek Cypriot refugees and their descendants. Their responses reveal a great deal of the same sentiments that Turkish Cypriots did in interviews with Rebecca Bryant. Many displaced persons from both sides were under the impression that they would return home shortly. "What stayed with me is that we left in the clothes that we were wearing. I was in shorts, a T-shirt, and clogs…'Nothing will happen,' I insisted. 'It's only for a few days and we are coming back."[91] Attachment to land and Cyprus's natural features also figured prominently in both narratives. A profound sense of loss permeates everything. Sonia, an expectant grandmother in 1974, revealed "most of all I miss the sea, the shores, the sunsets. The sunset was unbelievable. The whole of Kyrenia turned golden at sunset…The house itself was warm and beautiful."[92] Nadia, a teenager then, painted an idyllic picture in her interview. "I remember everything about the house. The verandas with flowerbeds that my grandmother used to plant with lilies…Citrus trees in the garden and the two fig trees,

---

[90] Olga Demetriou, *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Strife. Report Two. Life Stories: Greek Cypriot Community* (Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), 2012): 6, accessed March 19, 2014, http://www.prio-cyprus-displacement.net/images/users/1/Report%201-%20O.DEMETRIOU%20ENG.WEB.pdf.
[91] Ibid., 34.
[92] Ibid., 25.

one with big figs, one with small, a vine, and mulberry branches hanging over from the

neighbour's garden where the kids used to gather to eat the fruit."[93] She added,

> today I have a recurring dream that as if by magic the fences
> open up and I find my house. In another dream I am allowed
> to go up to a point but not beyond that[, and] this affects me much
> more…I feel I lost part of my life for which I never stopped
> mourning. I may have grown up, got married, lived in another
> country, but I have always felt that something happened to me
> about which I was completely unable to do anything, that they
> stole a part of my life…I lost my memories, the smells of my
> city, an integral part of my life…I feel as if I have lived all
> this time without a sense of belonging.[94]

Many others Demetriou interviewed expressed a similar feeling of loss. This

sentiment was not voiced as frequently in Bryant's talks with Turkish Cypriots, perhaps

because every new displacement progressively severed their ties with both their ancestral

land and the notion of a peaceful united Cyprus. In many ways, they understood the

reality better than did the Greek Cypriots.

Another noteworthy difference between the narratives of displaced Turks and

Greeks is the Greeks' preference to remember pre-1974 as a simpler and more peaceful

time. Dimitris, a Greek Cypriot, was born in 1976, but his family was displaced and so

he grew up with their stories. Sitting behind his desk is a picture of Kyrenia harbor in the

north, now in the Turkish-occupied territory. "…[it] was painted before 1974 and it

shows [Pentadaktylos] as a green mountain. This is a very different picture to what we

grew up with…bare, and figuring in these songs of return. In this picture it is something

different, with a small harbor with five fishing boats in it. Much simpler…."[95]

Greek Cypriots look back to pre-1974 wistfully and, perhaps, idealistically. The

---

[93] Ibid., 33-34.
[94] Ibid., 35.
[95] Ibid., 30.

plight of Turkish Cypriots during the same period plays little role in their memories of Cyprus during that time. The focus, rather, is on injustices done to the Greeks, and the lingering hatred nearly forty years after the war. Dimitris continued, "I hear all this empty rhetoric, which is actually not empty at all, it has a very specific content: division. Either on our own here, or on our own everywhere…us here, you there…with some minor land adjustment, us in our schools, you in your own, we hating you, you hating us, and that's it."[96] Demetriou and Bryant published these interviews only two years ago. The persistence of such sentiments, nearly forty years after partition, highlights the distance that must be traveled before reconciliation can occur. More importantly, they serve to underline the negative aspects of displacement: almost a half-century has passed, and these emotions still hover close to the surface.

Conclusions

Both Cypriot and Irish communities have witnessed the polarizing impact of migration. In Cyprus, Greek and Turkish Cypriots have remained isolated from each other for over forty years. In Northern Ireland, Protestants and Catholics have mixed to tenuous effects for nearly a century. The resulting differences are astounding. Whereas the Irish discuss each other with vivid animosity and blame, Greeks and Turks view their separation with bittersweet sadness. It is the loss of land and peace that plagues their memories, not bombs and raids. The physical boundary that divides Cyprus has kept the two sides separate, like little children during a spat. In Northern Ireland, the borders between Protestant and Catholic neighborhoods are technically permeable, but highly charged: "Whether you can see a boundary or you can't see a boundary, we all know

---

[96] Ibid., 31.

there are boundaries. People rarely cross over [them]."[97] In both situations, migration

and borders have prevented peace. The answer is not, as many Irish believe, further

division, for this would simply make the situation increasingly unstable. If the Northern

Irish voted to split their land into Catholic and Protestant regions, they would come

across some people who might refuse to leave their homes. From the beginning, then, the

idea of a homogenous and peaceful community would be compromised. Moreover, as

people moved into smaller areas, the borders would run the risk of becoming increasingly

polarized, effectively trapping the nominally homogenous population in its new

neighborhood. Instead, communities should be integrated. This will take time, for it

needs to become socially acceptable before it can be practically implemented. In order to

prevent further displacement, integration should first take place in the schools. This will

teach the next generation to cooperate and work together, to see each other as students

and humans, not as enemies. In both Ireland and Cyprus, partition has led to the forced

migration of thousands of people. There exists in both countries a strong attachment to

the land, which, for many, defines their past, present, and future. Displacement, then,

served as a violent blow to both Cypriot and Irish identities.

---

[97] Miller, "A Wall of Fear," *Los Angeles Times*.

Chapter 3: Ethnicity and Religion as Markers of Difference

Historians and social scientists have argued that a state's territorial division leads populations to split in one of two ways. Either, as in Ireland, India, and Palestine, they divide along ethnic or religious lines; or, as in Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, they part along political or ideological lines. Note that all those in the first group are former British colonies that divided in the beginning of the twentieth century or immediately following World War II, and that those in the second category happened in the context of the Cold War. Over the past century, it has become apparent that a state divides along whichever line, religious or political, it deems most influential and important in everyday life. In Ireland, India, and Palestine, this was ethnic; in Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, it was political. Yet, following the assertions of the sociologist Robert Schaeffer, I believe there are serious flaws in labeling demographical division as purely ethnic or political.[98] More often than not, the phrase "ethnic division" has served in past scholarship as a metaphor for ancient and intractable inter communal strife. Scholars across various fields, however, have demonstrated that a group rarely, if ever, divides because of ancient or primordial inter communal hatred. Instead it has become clear that most ethnic conflicts result from recent political, economic, or social issues. Still, foreign policymakers, especially in Cyprus, see an advantage in encouraging bilious relations between two groups, and then claiming that this new anger is the product of a lingering ancient hatred. By blaming ethnic rivalry, policymakers encourage a conflict's observers and participants to forego a rational understanding of a problem "that [has] nothing to do

---

[98] Schaeffer, *Warpaths*, 6.

with the complexities of ethnicity."[99] This mindset grows dangerous if allowed to

continue: it encourages polarized mentalities both locally and globally. In general,

blaming inter communal violence purely on ethnic rivalries is a gross simplification that

fails to take into account other internal and external factors.

Likewise, claiming that Cold War partitions occurred exclusively along

ideological (that is, Communist and non-Communist) lines fails to consider the

complexities of political realities on the ground. Just as political, economic and social

ambitions determined the actions of competing ethnic groups, so too did they guide

bilateral superpower politics in the second half of the twentieth century. In Cyprus, the

newly independent government's interest in autonomy led it to seek membership with the

Non-Aligned Movement. Its decision was motivated by fears of subordination should it

join the East-West political drama. While it was partitioned during the Cold War, it did

not split according to Cold War ideologies. The situation was similar in post-war

Germany, where the Soviets and Americans each wanted a united Germany, but only one

"that would serve its own [i.e. American or Soviet] interests."[100] The United States,

therefore, unified Germany's three western-occupied zones (1946), refused to extract

reparations (1947), and introduced a new currency (1948).[101] Soviet officials matched

American movements: they introduced their own currency (1948, two days after the

Americans) and blocked Allied access to Berlin. Soon, due to economic strategies by the

post-war superpowers, Germany was split.[102] Neither side in the Cold War was

---

[99] Peter Maass, *Love Thy Neighbor: A Story of War* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 69-70.
[100] Schaeffer, *Warpaths*, 124.
[101] Ibid., 125-6.
[102] Ibid., 127.

motivated exclusively by ideology; to say as much is tantamount to ignoring the underlying motives of each superpower, or the resistance movements that worked to undermine the authority of each bloc.

Ireland

Ireland partitioned in 1921 because of external interference, as I discussed in Chapter One. Moreover, according to the historian Daniel Webster Hollis III, the British determined the shape and nature of the division. In this case English authorities encouraged and exploited religious differences, which eventually forged the dividing line between communities in twentieth century Ireland.[103] We can first see the dominance of religion as dividing marker in the changes in post-partition demographics. The Protestant population in the new Irish Republic had dwindled down to 7.6 percent by 1926. The decline in Protestants was the result of an increase in migration across the border into Northern Ireland.[104] In the previous chapter I discussed the several boundaries within Northern Ireland that are defined by religion, and that separate Catholic and Protestant communities. Yet, it would be a mistake to call these divisions (or the ones between the Republic and Northern Ireland) "ancient." English authorities cultivated, hardened, and exploited them for nearly five hundred years through quasi-colonial policies that oppressed Catholicism and favored Protestantism. A close look at Irish history offers an explanation for the persistence of these religiously defined borders, and highlights the

---

[103] Daniel Webster Hollis III, *The Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations: The History of Ireland* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), 61.

[104] Ian N. Gregory et al., "Continuous Division, 1920s-1960s," in *Troubled Geographies: A Spatial History of Religion and Society in Ireland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), accessed March 13, 2014, http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/troubledgeogs/chap7.htm.

English, i.e. foreign, imposition of such divisions. This, once again, illustrates the negative results of external interference.

In the 1530s, English authorities in Ireland established the Church of Ireland as a way to implement the Protestant Reformation among what they considered to be a wild and savage population. From early on, Protestants in Ireland retained a deep animosity for the Catholics, likening the Pope to the Anti-Christ.[105] Over the centuries, meanwhile, the Irish Catholics grew to equate the Irish Protestants with the English conqueror, whose sole goal was to destroy and control Irish culture and territory. Indeed the relationship between Catholics and Protestants on the island may best be described as that between conquerors and the conquered.[106]   Although Ireland was never an English colony in the traditional sense, it is appropriate to consider the population's separation after 1921 in the context of other British colonies. The division happened essentially along religious lines, and the reason for this lies with the British introduction of Protestantism several centuries earlier. The current communal divisions between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland are informed by this long history of dispute between the two communities.

When the British parliament crafted the Government of Ireland Act in 1920, the six counties of Northern Ireland emerged as a self-governing and Protestant region in the island's north.[107] After 1921, Catholics accounted for approximately forty-three percent of the population in Northern Ireland. Communal divisions there grew.[108] This new minority refused to accept the Border, and Catholic nationalist parties abstained from participating in the new government under the assumption that they would never be able

---

[105] Webster Hollis III, *The History of Ireland*, 45.
[106] Ibid., 61.
[107] Moody and Martin, *The Course of Irish History*, 274
[108] Webster Hollis III, *The History of Ireland,* 5.

to have real authority in the North's political system.[109] Meanwhile, the Protestant

majority lived in fear of reprisal from those in the "powerful and ideologically intense

Catholic Church" for supporting centuries of anti-Catholic policies.[110] As both sides

constructed barriers that segregated Catholic and Protestant communities, the North spent

the next forty years in an increasingly polarized climate. In 1968, a group of English

loyalists, "fearing a rebellion under the guise of civil rights agitation," attacked a Catholic

community.[111] The Irish Republican Army (IRA) retaliated and, in doing so, set off a

thirty-year terrorist campaign that the Good Friday Agreement, signed by British, Irish,

and Northern Irish politicians, tenuously ended only in 1998.[112]

    In the sixteen years since that agreement, outright animosity has only marginally

declined. In its place have emerged deeply entrenched views that offer little room for

reconciliation. It is worth mentioning again the September 2001 stone-throwing incident

in Belfast.[113] "That's what happens when you get them separated like that," a Protestant

cab driver said casually to a reporter.[114] This cab driver's statement is innocuous and

vague: he identifies no specific threat or viewpoint that might tie him directly to Northern

Ireland. He has, it would appear, largely accepted the violence and segregation. This

brief overview of Northern Ireland's last century is meant to highlight two observations.

First, for nearly five hundred years, the British used religion as an instrument for

---

[109] John Lloyd, "A difficult subject; while most children in Northern Ireland attend
Catholic or Protestant schools, a growing minority are being educated together. But as
John Lloyd discovered, integrated schooling remains a divisive topic," *Financial Times*,
April 21, 2007, accessed March 6, 2014.
[110] Ibid.
[111] Ibid.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.

division. English authorities' anti-Catholic policies allowed Protestant officials in Ireland to keep much of the population subjugated. By 1921, the idea of separated communities had become so ingrained in global and local perception of Irish culture that it was difficult to imagine any other reality. Second, partition exists in three places in Ireland: between the Republic and Ulster, between the North's Protestant and Catholic communities, and in the minds of those Irish who cannot fathom an integrated North.[115]

The thirty-year violence in post-partition Ireland has no counterpart in Cyprus. This can be attributed to two factors in particular: the continued presence of UNFICYP, and the total separation between Turkish and Greek communities. Though the peacekeepers have done little in the way of resolving Cypriot partition, they have to a great extent limited the intrusion of division and inter communal animosity into everyday life. Likewise, the complete polarization of the island's population means that ethnic conflicts like those before partition no longer pose a serious threat to the island's welfare. Moreover, memories of the last significant burst of inter communal violence in 1974 have faded as new generations have appeared. In Cyprus, the border has been relatively silent, and it is up to those who remember the earlier conflicts to keep the tension alive. In Ireland, there is no other option.

Cyprus

Both British colonial and Cold War politics have shaped the partition of Cyprus and inter communal relations on the island. British rule from 1878 to 1960 left its mark, and global politics played a hand in the island's 1974 division. Still, although Cold War politics were important, I would argue that decades of British rule had a much greater

---

[115] This observation is well articulated in Frank Delaney's novel *Ireland,* which follows a young boy as he travels through 1960s Ireland and attempts to understand his country's history. In particular, see page 341.

impact on Cyprus's partition history. Following Turkey's invasion in 1974, Cyprus split

almost entirely along ethnic lines. Today, native Turkish Cypriots and immigrant Turks

comprise nearly all of the north's population. The south, in turn, is home to nearly all of

the island's Greek Cypriots. Public opinion in 1974 was that these inter communal

differences were as ancient as they were intractable. Greek Cypriots and Turkish

Cypriots could not coexist. In an article from June 1964, the *Irish Times* discussed

UNFICYP's failure to significantly ease tensions on Cyprus, and suggested that it was

"wrong to think that divisions as deep and as ancient as those that separate the Greek-

Cypriots from the Turks could yield to a few months' cooling off."[116] Over eighty years

of British policies had helped divide Greek and Turkish Cypriots in seemingly

irresolvable ways.

      One of Britain's first policies was that of favoring the island's minority

population, the Turkish Cypriots. From early on, they vaulted the group into positions of

power to prevent the Greek Cypriot majority from strengthening its claim to self-rule and

independence. This aligned well with the interests of Turkish Cypriots, who feared

Greek Cypriots would use any authority to implement *enosis*.[117] By 1919, the Turkish

Cypriots had formed the "backbone of the British administrative system," and had grown

to be a valuable ally.[118] Though they comprised roughly one-quarter of Cyprus's

population, Turkish Cypriots represented 420 members of the 789-member police

force.[119] Moreover, the Turkish Cypriots on the Legislative Council (which had only

---

[116] "Ad Interim," *Irish Times*, June 18, 1964, 11.
[117] Henn, *A Business of Some Heat*, 8.
[118] Michael Attalides, *Cyprus: Nationalism and international politics* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), 41.
[119] Ibid.

marginal influence in British administrative policies) voted against British policies only twice.[120] The effects of what may be termed British "divide and rule" policy can be seen in the trials of members of Cyprus's Greek nationalist party EOKA. In the 1950s, British authorities tried and hung many EOKA men, but spared most of those in the Turkish Cypriots' counterpart, the Turkish Resistance Organization (TMT).[121] The British decision to favor the Turkish minority inflamed Greek Cypriot opinion towards both the colonizers and their clients. To a great extent, English policies successfully divided the Cypriot populations: from 1891 to 1960, the number of mixed villages on the island steadily declined as Greeks and Turks increasingly chose to live with their respective ethnic communities.[122]

The 1960 constitution further confirmed the devastating long-term effects of British policy on national unity. Under the threat of losing British patronage, Turkish Cypriots – worried about a Greek monopoly on power and an end to Turkish authority – pushed for, and won, an extraordinarily disproportionate level of power. The constitution was grounded in the power-sharing principles of proportionality, coalition, cultural autonomy, and minority veto.[123] The size of each ethnic group determined its representation in parliament (proportionality); both Greek and Turkish Cypriots worked together through the Council of Ministers (coalition); each ethnic group had its own Communal Chamber at the legislative level (cultural autonomy); and both the Greek

---

[120] Ibid., 42.

[121] The British formed a police force to counter EOKA, and drew its members from the Turkish Cypriot paramilitary group "Volkan," which later evolved into TMT. The closeness between the British and Turkish Cypriots may explain why so few members of TMT were ever tried or convicted of crimes against the crown. (Hitchens, *Cyprus*, 46.)

[122] In 1891, there were 346 mixed villages; 252 in 1931; and, only 114 in 1960. (Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus*, 5.)

[123] Yakinthou, *Political Settlements in Divided Societies*, 52-3.

president and the Turkish Vice President held veto power (minority veto).[124] Although

Turkish Cypriots continued to account for roughly twenty percent of the island's

population, the constitution assured them power through legislative procedures that

rivaled that of the Greek Cypriot community, which constituted approximately eighty

percent. The Council of Ministers, for instance, existed to ensure the power of both the

President and Vice-President; it was comprised of seven Greek Ministers and three

Turkish Ministers.[125] Council decisions required a majority, but either the President or

the Vice President could veto the result. In legislative matters, the Greek community

elected seventy percent of the House of Representatives, and the Turkish community

elected thirty percent.[126] Moreover, Greek representatives elected the Greek President of

the House of Representatives, and the Turkish delegates elected the Turkish Vice-

President of the House.[127] Both groups had their own communal chamber, which held

legislative power over ethnic-specific issues, such as religious, educational, judicial, and

cultural matters.[128] In fact, they even had the power to tax members of the community.[129]

These constitutional guarantees to each communal group reveal two issues with Cypriot

independence. First, they illustrate the success of British policies that kept the

populations divided. Second, they suggest that the independence documents perpetuated

these differences by granting each group a significant degree of autonomy. Moreover,

---

[124] Ibid.

[125] "Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus," Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus, accessed March 6, 2014, http://www.presidency.gov.cy/presidency/presidency.nsf/all/1003AEDD83EED9C7C225 756F0023C6AD/$file/CY_Constitution.pdf.

[126] "Article 62 of the Constitution."

[127] "Article 72 of the Constitution."

[128] "Article 87 of the Constitution."

[129] "Article 87 of the Constitution."

many politicians in Cyprus's new government were taken from the ranks of each nationalist movement; this crippled any attempt at unifying the communities. Both groups "planned for the time when the Republic would break down and there would be a free-for-all for territory that would become Greek or Turkish."[130]

In 1963, three years after Cypriot independence, President Makarios published his "Thirteen Points" letter. Turkish Cypriots were outraged with his suggestions, and felt that the President had made his first step in pushing them out of the government. They wanted to view the Republic as one composed of two communities, not one composed of a majority and a minority.[131] Makarios's suggestions would have threatened this vision, and many scholars point to the President's blunt suggestions as reason for the outbreak of violence in December 1963 (*Kanli Noel*). While the President's decision to address the public before consulting with his Turkish Cypriot colleagues was unorthodox, it also illustrates the incompatibility of Cyprus's constitution with its reality. Makarios's failed attempt to break down the ethnic barriers and separatism demonstrates how entrenched the idea of separate ethnicities had become in Cypriot culture.

The Cold War began to overtly affect Cypriot politics after the island's independence. In the aftermath of 1960 and Britain's overall loss of global power, Turkey, Greece, the United States, and the Soviet Union began to meddle in the island's affairs.[132] Cold War politics drove many of their policies, even those from Cyprus itself. Though the Cold War system of alliances demanded loyalties from less powerful nations,

---

[130] Attalides, *Cyprus*, 55.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Attalides, *Cyprus*, 57.

Cyprus remained relatively impermeable to American and Soviet courtship, and, even under pressure, did not renounce its non-aligned status.

Mid-century American and Soviet policy makers, usually at odds on matters of foreign policy, agreed on the future of Cyprus: both wanted partition. Each camp was driven by concern for the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). For the United States, NATO's southern flank had to be protected at any cost. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, Greece and Turkey frequently prepared to go to war to defend their national interests in Cyprus. Such a regional disturbance would weaken NATO's credibility in the region, and could lead to the spread of Soviet influence. Moreover, Cyprus's position as a non-aligned state in the Cold War meant that its total independence posed "a strategic liability" to the West.[133] Hence, American leaders such as President Johnson encouraged a systematic division of the island into a Turkish north and Greek south. That would simultaneously (and possibly only temporarily) end the Greco-Turkish dispute, and draw Cyprus closer into the non-Communist camp.[134] Like the British before them, the Americans detracted from Cypriot sovereignty in order to maintain larger regional control. Following the 1974 coup, Joseph Sisco, the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs at the US Department of State, argued that the two objectives of the United States were to "avert war between Greece and Turkey…and avert Soviet exploitation of the situation."[135] For Washington, Cyprus became another Cold War proxy conflict as soon as it gained independence.

---

[133] O'Malley and Craig, *The Cyprus Conspiracy*, 109.
[134] Schaeffer, *Warpaths*, 242.
[135] Meeting minutes, WSAG Meeting, 15 July 1974, Cyprus Crisis (3), box 7, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Gerald R. Ford Library.

Meanwhile, the Soviets, led by Nikita Krushchev (1894-1971) and Leonid Brezhnev (1906-1982),[136] also supported Cypriot partition, but because they hoped that it would lead to further conflict within NATO.[137] The Soviets' reaction to the 1974 coup was not concern for the island's population or sovereignty. Rather, they viewed it as an opportunity to weaken American prestige. Accordingly, they blamed American officials for instigating the coup in an attempt to make Cyprus into a NATO base.[138] This would, they feared, bring Americans closer to the Soviet sphere of influence. It would also ensure American presence in the Eastern Mediterranean for the foreseeable future.[139]

In general, it can be said that Cold War politics sought to overrule Cypriot sovereignty. Following independence, though, Archbishop Makarios and his new government struggled against this. When faced with the choice of entering NATO or joining the Non-Aligned Movement, they chose the latter. Their decision reflected a deep awareness of the Cold War political dilemma. Had Cyprus entered NATO, Greece's interests would consistently be ignored in favor of Turkey, whose strategic importance as neighbor to the Soviet Union ranked it high on the West's list of allies. Turkey also favored Cyprus's decision to avoid NATO. If it had joined, the government in Ankara would have been prevented from ever intervening in the island's domestic disputes. "The idea of one NATO member invading another, and the consequences of this on alliance unity at the height of the Cold War, would almost certainly ensure that the United States and other NATO members would step in to prevent full scale hostilities

---

[136] Krushchev served as General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1953-1964. His successor, Brezhnev, served from 1964-1982.
[137] Schaeffer, *Warpaths*, 243.
[138] Memo, Cyprus Situation Report #3, 15 July 1974, Cyprus Crisis (3), box 7, Kissinger-Scowcroft West Wing Office Files, Gerald R. Ford Library.
[139] Ibid.

from occurring."[140] In the years preceding independence, Archbishop Makarios had

grown increasingly close with leaders of post-colonial states, and in 1955 he attended a

conference to discuss an Afro-Asian alliance in the face of Soviet and Western policies.

In 1961, the new president joined leaders of twenty-five other states to create the Non-

Aligned Movement. And so, Cypriots not only took part, but also helped form a

movement that separated it from its past colonizers and current questionable allies. Until

the end of the Cold War nearly thirty years later, Cyprus remained a member of the Non-

Aligned Movement. Its decision to forego an alliance with either the East or the West

highlights a narrative that has been overlooked in many histories of Cyprus. Typically,

discussions on the island's historical politics emphasize its submissiveness and

subordination. The new government's bold decision to take the path of non-alignment

represents its attempts "to forge its own individual sovereign identity" after years of

colonization.[141]

Cyprus played an important role in Cold War strategies, but it never became a

breeding ground for Cold War ideology. The most prominent political issues on the

island concerned, rather, the idea of ethnic or religious identity. President Makarios's

decision to join the Non-Aligned Movement stifled significant manifestation of Cold War

ideologies in Cyprus. As a result, ethnic differences, not political ones, continued to

dominate post-independence discussions. Because the British lived on and ruled over

Cyprus for nearly a century, the relatively new Cold War political divisions played a

small role in the ultimate division of Cyprus's ethnic communities.

---

[140] James Ker-Lindsay, "Shifting Alignments: The External Orientations of Cyprus since Independence," *The Cyprus Review* 22.2 (Fall 2010), 68.
[141] Ibid., 73.

Conclusions

Though Ireland and Cyprus are on opposite sides of the world, their experiences under British rule were remarkably similar. In both, years of British authority cultivated and inflamed communal tension; in both, partition split each country almost exclusively between religious and ethnic groups. Although Cyprus divided during the Cold War, it did not do so because of Cold War politics. The potent effects of British and Ottoman colonial policies based on patronage of the Turkish Cypriots, as well as Cyprus's decision to join the Non-Aligned Movement, overpowered other political motivations in 1974. That year, Turkey forced partition on Cyprus. The subsequent migrations, not obligatory, resulted in an almost completely ethnically polarized island. The legacy of British rule in Ireland and its policies of religious division meant that the island remained locked in an endless cycle of inter communal violence. Today, Irish religious differences remain both powerful and often-violent communal dividers that show little sign of disappearing. In Cyprus, ethnic tensions continue to exist as well, but inter communal violence has largely been avoided as a result of UNFICYP and ethnic separation. For both countries, though, the legacy of British policy lingers on, decades after the decolonization movement. It would be impractical to blame the partitions solely on British policies, but there is no doubt that they greatly contributed to tension in both cases.

Chapter 4: Ireland Reacts to Turmoil in Cyprus

Reactions to events are almost always more interesting than the events themselves. In this final section, therefore, I have selected three key periods in Cypriot history and explored the responses of two Irish newspapers, the *Irish Times* and the *Irish Independent*. The three instances in question are Cypriot independence, *Kanli Noel*, and the 1974 war. Not only are all pivotal points in Cyprus's brief experiment with unified independence, but they also present different combinations of the trademarks of partition discussed throughout this thesis. By removing myself from the island's history, I am able to consider the larger implications of these key years on Cyprus's present situation.

Irish newspapers were not my first choice. I originally intended to compare the responses of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot journalists. Due to my language limitations and accessibility to the relevant archives, this was not possible. However, Ireland and Cyprus have a startlingly similar past, and the experience and personal history of many Irish journalists make their articles a fascinating read. I chose Irish papers – rather than those in another twentieth century partitioned society – for four reasons in particular. First, both countries had a complicated relationship with Great Britain that ultimately played a large role in the emergence and persistence of a partition. During the early centuries of their rule over Ireland, English authorities took little care to understand the island's geography or its people: "the English colonial presence in Ireland remained superimposed upon an ancient identity, alien and bizarre."[142] I saw parallels between this relationship and the one inculcated by the British in Cyprus. In both cases,

---

[142] Foster, *Modern Ireland*, 3.

the British encouraged the separation of ethnic groups; in both, British policies played a significant role in the unrest. Second, both Ireland and Cyprus experienced a partition almost entirely along ethnic or religious lines. In Cyprus, descriptions of the partition frequently use the phrases "Turkish Muslim north" or "Greek south." One's land (and, by extension, one's heritage) plays a significant role in how a Cypriot identifies himself or herself.[143] Likewise, Northern Ireland and Ireland have been locked in a struggle characterized (in one sense) by religion for nearly a century.[144] Third, Irish newspapers are primarily written in English. (Although, interestingly enough, editorials written in Gaelic appeared in the *Irish Independent* during the period in question.) While the partition and British angles appear in other situations – India, Pakistan, Israel, Palestine – the wealth of English sources in Ireland facilitates research and analysis. Fourth, my personal connections to both islands – my mother is Irish and my father is Cypriot – heightened the appeal of exploring the countries' experiences with partition.

Methodology

Newspapers primarily report facts; their task is to inform the readership of events in the community and the world at large. As I mentioned earlier, though, reactions to the facts provide a great deal more insight into the author and his audience. For this reason, I chose to look at reviews, editorials, Letters to the Editor, photographs, and political cartoons. I studied the *Irish Independent* entirely on microfilm, and in doing so was forced to explore developments on a day-by-day basis. I did not have the same experience with the *Irish Times*, which I accessed primarily through ProQuest database (results filtered for year, subject, and article type). Nevertheless, the selection of articles

[143] Hitchens, *Cyprus*, 22.
[144] Joseph E. Fallon, "Ireland: Two states, two nations," *World Affairs* 158.2 (Fall 1995): 71, accessed January 3, 2014.

studied in this paper are, I feel, representative of each newspaper's take on Cypriot

politics between 1959 and 1974. Both papers addressed each time period from one of

three angles: as a commentary on the British, as contemplation of the similarities between

Ireland and Cyprus, and as a general analysis of the situation. This chapter is organized

around these themes.

My decision to analyze the *Irish Times* and the *Irish Independent* was not random.

Each paper represents the opposite end of the political spectrum. I was interested,

therefore, to see if they would take different stances on Cypriot independence, inter

communal fighting, and partition. The *Times*, founded in 1859, was staunchly loyalist

and unionist, and opposed all forms of home rule.[145] The *Irish Independent*, though, has

tended to favor the idea of a unified Ireland. (That is, the unification of Northern Ireland

and the Republic of Ireland into one state.[146]) These Irish nationalists in general have

tended to be Catholic, and this religious identification appears periodically in articles

about Cyprus.[147] I do not mean for this chapter to be an intense comparative analysis of

each partitioned country.[148] Rather, it is intended to emphasize that broad similarities

exist between divided communities, though they be separated by both time and space.

In general, I expected both to have a negative view of partition, and particularly of

British involvement in Cypriot politics. Though they may oppose each other politically,

---

[145] Mark O'Brien, *The Irish Times: A History* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008), 13.
[146] Ashley J. Randal, "ON THE WORLD Irish nationalist compares cause to South's civil rights struggle," *The Atlanta Journal*, February 28, 1997.
[147] Zachary E. McCabe, "Northern Ireland: The Paramilitaries, Terrorism, and September 11th," *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* Vol. 30, Issue 4 (2001-2002), 547-548.
[148] For more information on this subject, see Zachary E. McCabe's article "Northern Ireland: The Paramilitaries, Terrorism, and September 11th." He does an excellent job of summarizing the key points in twentieth century Irish history.

journalists of both papers had lived in a divided country for nearly half a century; I

expected their experiences would have encouraged an anti-partition attitude. This proved

to be the case. Both the *Times* and the *Independent* heavily criticized the British behavior

towards the idea of Cypriot independence. Moreover, both papers felt strongly towards

Turkish intervention in 1974, and quickly foresaw its possible ramifications. However,

what interested me the most was the unexpected: the frequency and depth of coverage

was remarkably different for both the *Times* and the *Independent*. After *Kanli Noel*, the

former stayed rather shallow, preferring to address the issues superficially. The latter,

though, began reporting on Cypriot events in an extraordinarily inclusive manner. It

published Letters to the Editor from both sides and it provided in-depth interviews with

UN Secretary General U Thant and Archbishop Makarios. The interest in reaching out

and instructing readers on the basic facts and their implications is remarkable, and was

likely done as part of an effort to better acquaint readers with the global political

environment.

After reading a number of articles it became clear that, in their reporting, the

journalists frequently drew parallels between the two islands. Despite the similarities of

individual responses to partition, the type of reporting varied significantly between the

two papers. Cypriot independence in 1960 received little mention in the *Independent*

beyond a brief notice on page nine.[149] (By comparison, Kenya's independence several

weeks earlier[150] had garnered it a front-page article, an editorial, and a further article later

in the issue.) In contrast, *Irish Times* reported and analyzed the negotiations and

---

[149] "Independence Day for Cyprus," *Irish Independent*, August 16, 1960, 9.
[150] "Kenya," CIA Factbook, accessed December 30, 2013,
https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ke.html

agreements extensively. This was the last time it would address Cyprus so intricately. It

focused primarily on critiquing the British government, although a great deal of reporting

concerned the relationship between EOKA leader George Grivas and Archbishop

Makarios. Both papers addressed Irish unwillingness to send troops with UNFICYP in

1964, and both roundly blamed the British for creating the mess in the first place. In

1974, though – the year in which many might assume Irish newspapers exploded with

opinions on the island's partition – only the *Irish Independent* did so. During July and

August of that year, it began simultaneously reporting the day's Cypriot developments,

and carefully analyzing both the events and the major actors. The *Irish Times*, in

comparison, continued to take a broader approach, and wrote primarily about the Greek

colonels and Turkish government.

Commentary on the British
Overwhelmingly, and across all three periods in question, both papers criticized

British behavior in Cyprus. However, each differed in the type of coverage it provided.

During the 1959 independence negotiations, the *Irish Times* gave readers a blow-by-blow

description and analysis of British behavior, though it wrote little of Cypriot leaders or

their attitudes towards the negotiations. Journalists at that paper, it would seem, viewed

the outside world through a British lens. The British famously garnered 99 non-

negotiable square miles on Cyprus that would serve as British military bases after

independence.[151] For the *Times*, it would seem that this issue was a breaking point. In

January 1960, it pointed out that if Great Britain would only "renounce" total control

over the sovereign bases it could greatly reduce tensions.[152] Later that month it wrote

---

[151] Hitchens 24.
[152] "Bases in Cyprus," *Irish Times*, January 7, 1960, 5.

63

that British attitude towards its bases is "unnecessarily severe and undeviating," and it roundly condemned the British after negotiations fell through.[153] Great Britain, it pointed out, "should know that the problem of keeping military bases in an independent country is a sore and sensitive one, especially if that country has only freshly achieved nationhood, after a fierce and bitter struggle."[154] Indeed, there is a general sense of confusion over why the British refused to be more "accommodating" and relent on their demands for military bases.[155] If any doubt remained of its position towards Anglo-Cypriot relations, it was likely dispelled in January 1960 with the following observation: "Once more, as has happened so often in the past, Britain has held out the olive branch with the mailed fist, and fatally embittered military negotiations."[156] This was the second time in a year that the *Irish Times* referred to Britain in this way.[157] The *Times'* identification as a historically unionist paper suggests it would approve of direct British rule in Cyprus. However, frustration is evident in the 1959-1960 articles on Cyprus, and it only grows more pronounced with the reemergence of violence in 1963.

The *Irish Independent*, in contrast, wrote relatively little about Cypriot negotiations on independence. When it did, the focus was on Anglo-Cypriot discussions of sovereign bases and financial assistance. The similarities with the *Irish Times* stop here, though, because the *Independent*'s most significant address of the Cyprus problem took a sharp stab at British colonial practices. (While the *Times* critiqued British policy

---

[153] "Delayed Action," *Irish Times*, January 19, 1960, 5.
[154] Ibid.
[155] "Dangers Doldrums," *Irish Times*, February 9, 1960, 7.
[156] "Delayed Action," *Irish Times*.
[157] The other was in January 1959: "it is to be feared that the British administration is still allowing too much of the iron hand to show through the velvet glove" ("Talking of Cyprus," *Irish Times*, January 19, 1959, 5.

in Cyprus and merely alluded to other situations, the *Independent* did so more specifically.) In August 1960, three days before Cypriot independence, the paper published the following review of a book about Britain and India:

> [the author] is not sensitive about the natural need of a people to express their own particular character in their institutions. He writes: "Wherever you lift the corner of the political or administrative blanket the things we know are the things that work[,] the things that work are the things we know. And the bulk of both are British." This is dangerously near assuming that all peoples have the same methods of dealing with each other and of doing their work, and that one's own country's methods are necessarily the best.[158]

Though the paper's criticism was directed at the book's author, it can be viewed in a more general sense as the publication's attitude towards British foreign policy.[159] Whereas the *Irish Times* skirted around the issue as best it could, and frequently employed flowery imagery, the *Independent* bluntly stated that the British did not always do the right thing, and frequently shoved local traditions under the rug in the process. As with the *Times*, though, 1963 brought a more extreme reaction.

Both the *Irish Times* and the *Irish Independent* reported on *Kanli Noel* in detail. Indeed, it could be argued that this was the first time that Cyprus really figured in Irish daily life, for it raised the issue of Irish participation in UNFICYP. Both papers reported the country's reluctance to join the peacekeeping force. More importantly, though, both papers had the same initial response: condemnation of the British, and criticism towards its colonial policies. A Letter to the Editor in the *Irish Times* claimed that the 1960 provisions for Turkish Cypriots had been ridiculous and unworkable, and that the fault

---

[158] "What Britain Did for India," *Irish Independent*, August 13, 1960, 8.

[159] The rest of the article, too long to transcribe here, was clearly written by a very frustrated reviewer who could not understand the author's lack of respect for indigenous institutions and traditions.

rested with the British for privileging the minority group pre-independence.[160] It went on

to say that the British were responsible for fixing this new problem: "There are the ghosts

of enough murdered Cypriots haunting the corridors of the Colonial Office already."[161]

The inflammatory nature of this comment is remarkable, as is the fact that the *Irish Times*

decided to publish it. It suggests a departure from the rather benign "mailed fist"-type

comment. The *Irish Independent* took a similar approach, and suggested that the British

were responsible for the "ill-feeling" between the Turkish Cypriots and Greek

Cypriots.[162] It is remarkable that both papers, though from opposing ends of the political

spectrum, united on this issue. More importantly, these comments were some of the last

the papers provided on British action in Cyprus. For them, it would appear that

responsibility for future Cypriot turmoil rested on the shoulders of the Cypriots

themselves.

The 1974 invasion raised new issues that put to rest any question of British blame,

and raised, instead, the question of Turkish blame. This is better addressed in a later

section, but suffice it to say that neither paper significantly critiqued British policy during

the 1974 war. The bulk of criticism emerged, rather, during a period of intense Anglo-

Cypriot relations (1959), and during a time of unanticipated tension (1963). Neither

paper provided a strong defense of British policies, even though one was historically a

staunch unionist. This is an incredibly important point: regardless of prior experience

with British policy, both Irish papers ultimately criticized the imperial power. This is

likely primarily a product of the times (a post-war anti-colonialism, independence

---

[160] "Letters to the Editor," *Irish Times*, January 1, 1964, 13.
[161] "Letters to the Editor," *Irish Times*.
[162] "Cyprus Explodes," *Irish Independent*, January 2, 1964, 10.

period). It does, though, indicate a significant shift in favor of the Cypriots that will be important to remember when considering how Irish papers treated the Ireland-Cyprus similarities.

Ireland and Cyprus

From early on, both papers were intimately aware of the similarities between Ireland and Cyprus. After Turkey's invasion, the inevitable comparisons became impossible to ignore, and a writer with the *Irish Independent* wrote the following rather mournful text:

> For Cyprus is startlingly similar to Ireland in so many ways –
> in its political and religious divisions, in the entrenched attitudes
> of opposing forces, in the suspicion, distrust and fear which
> dominates the thinking of the divided communities, in the tragic
> polarization of the Moslem Turkish Cypriots cut off by sand-bags
> and barbed wire from the Orthodox Greek Cypriots and in the
> strength of the old mythologies. At almost every level, one could
> draw parallels with Catholic republicans and Protestant loyalists
> and the intransigent cul-de-sacs into which history has manoeuvred
> them.[163]

Meanwhile, in a review of a biography on Archbishop Makarios the *Times* wrote: "From an Irish point of view, the fascination of the book, and of the Cyprus problem itself, is the attempt to resolve a majority-minority situation, where the two sides have historically held totally incompatible aspirations."[164] For the Irish, Cyprus's issues seemed to confirm their fears that institutionalized power sharing could never work in Ireland.

In reports on Cypriot independence, reporters mentioned frequently the shared complicated relationship with Great Britain. And, as the years went on (and certainly by the time of the Turkish invasion), Irish journalists grew increasingly conscious of the

---

[163] Desmond Rushe, "The warmth and honesty of Makarios," *Irish Independent*, July 18, 1974, 10.
[164] "The Independent Archbishop," *Irish Times*, July 25, 1974, 10.

possibility that the Mediterranean island might also be partitioned.[165] Their response was overwhelmingly negative. The *Irish Times* expressed it mildly in a January 1960 article: "As this country [Ireland] knows full well, the drawing of a boundary almost always leads to trouble."[166] The *Independent* was more blunt: partition was "'a last resort – and even that would not hold.'"[167] While both papers certainly addressed the issue, the *Irish Independent*'s coverage was more comprehensive and detailed. For that reason, this section will focus on that paper's observations; I will, though, point out areas where differences between the newspapers appear.

The *Independent*'s articles illustrate two important issues: Irish sentiment towards participation in UNFICYP, and perception of the Cypriots as fellow sufferers. Following *Kanli Noel* in December 1963, the United Nations (UN) approached Ireland's government about providing troops for a joint peacekeeping force on Cyprus. Both papers reported a general unwillingness to do so. This might come as a surprise, for it seems only natural that Ireland would wish to intervene and stop partition from becoming a reality elsewhere. However, fear of partition was exactly what made the Irish hesitate. In March 1964, the *Independent* reported that one of the biggest worries of the government in deciding to send troops to Cyprus "is the danger that partition might be resorted to as a solution to the Cyprus problem. It is felt that Irish troops could not, in present circumstances, be associated with partition anywhere."[168] The government's

---

[165] The initial concern was division between Cypriots and the British sovereign bases. Later, though, it evolved into concern over division between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.
[166] "Bases in Cyprus," *Irish Times*.
[167] "Partition is No Solution, says Douglas-Home," *Irish Independent*, February 22, 1964, 1.
[168] Political Correspondent, "Government May Send a Token Force," *Irish Independent*, March 5, 1964, 1.

qualms were also the result of financial concerns. However, its reluctance is a serious

concern. As a divided country, it should have been first in line to participate in

UNFICYP; that way, it could have worked closely with Cypriot, Greek, and Turkish

officials to ensure that partition would never happen. Instead, it stayed on the sidelines

until the last possible moment. Its hesitation is, in one sense, a terrible reflection on the

Irish. However, it also reveals the harmful (and paralytic) effects of partition. The

Independent reported the public's unease with UNFICYP; this suggests that old

grievances continued to exist and old wounds remained open. On Cyprus, partition has

had a similar effect. Today, nearly forty years later, a displaced Turkish Cypriot claims

feelings of "melancholy" when he sees his old home.[169] Another said, "I'm just not

drawn to the village anymore. It's a really different feeling, and I probably don't want to

go because it will upset me."[170] Cypriot officials today would likely have the same

reaction to a request to participate in a UN peacekeeping force to a country in danger of

partition, and for the same reasons: financial, and fear of watching another society divide.

   Following Turkey's intervention in 1974, the *Independent* exploded with articles

that connected the two islands. Most noteworthy were those that discussed Archbishop

Makarios, for the president himself did a commendable job connecting the Irish and

Cypriot plights. Journalists often then continued in this vein, simultaneously lamenting

the inflamed Cypriot situation and the intransigent Irish one. Soon before the invasion

the paper published the following interview with the Archbishop:

> I asked President Makarios if it could not be possible to arrive
> at the stage where Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots would
> look on themselves primarily as Cypriots and join together for

---

[169] Bryant, *Displacement in Cyprus*, 38.
[170] Ibid., 41.

the welfare of their lovely island and, at the same time, retain
their legitimate cultural ties with the civilisations that moulded
them. He agreed, wistfully, that that would be the ideal solution,
but he said, with great sadness that he saw no hope of it happening.
The Irish problem, he added, would be easier to solve. His thinking
was nothing if not realistic, and if one applies the same question
to Ireland, one can see why. Is it possible here to reach the stage
where republicans and loyalists would look on themselves primarily
as Irish and join together for the welfare of our island and, at
the same time, retain legitimate ties with those influences which
have fashioned their allegiances. That, too, would be the ideal
solution. But is it possible?[171]

This excerpt also illustrates a keen Irish understanding of the problems with partition.
Both the journalist and Archbishop Makarios recognize that a key step to unification and
peace would be the dissolution of sharp ethnic differentiations in favor of a unified
national identity. Indeed, an article ten years earlier pointed to the 1960 constitution's
failure to do this as a key reason for the outbreak of December violence.[172] A political
cartoon from August 1974 – when it was almost certain that the island would be
partitioned – offers a break from the serious reporting that surrounds it. In it, the island
of Cyprus decides to ask Ireland for advice on how to handle division; if these two
partitioned countries cannot find a solution, then Cyprus will go to Great Britain. After
all, she has more experience in the area.

On the surface, this cartoon suggests that the *Independent* can poke fun at
Ireland's partition. Yet, it is clear that it continues to harbor resentment on the subject.
Moreover, the cartoonist suggests that partition binds countries together into a clique.
The *Independent*'s reports on Cyprus go beyond simple factual analysis; they illustrate a
feeling of camaraderie and sympathy for Cypriot division.

---

[171] Rushe, "The warmth and honesty of Makarios." Typos not author's.
[172] "Cyprus Explodes," *Irish Independent*, January 2, 1964, 10.

Reporters' views of the situation

Most of this chapter has focused on trends in writing, particularly subject-wise.

In this third and final section, though, I address attitudes as expressed through the

articles. This will, I believe, provide a more complete understanding of the complex

relationship the Irish public had with Cypriot politicians and citizens. The attitude of the

Irish Times – which was lukewarm with regards to the Cypriots' plight – shifts noticeably

when looked at from this perspective. In contrast, the *Irish Independent* continues with

its positive reporting of the island and sympathy with its inhabitants. It is worth noting,

however, that the *Independent* frames its articles in a very unique way. Also of interest is

the 1964 appearance in each paper of the story of Solomon. In the *Irish Times* this took

the form of a letter from a disgruntled Greek Cypriot named Frixos Joannides:

> Why must [the Greek Cypriots] be uprooted from the soil
> on which they have lived for literally thousands of years and
> which is soaked with their sweat and blood in order to make
> room for others? Why must Solomon's sword come down
> on a living organism which has proved in the course of its
> long history that it is capable of achievements not only for itself
> but also for the world at large?[173]

In the same year, an article in the *Independent* claimed that an Australian had been

selected for the "'Solomon' task" of heading Cyprus's Supreme Constitutional Court.[174]

This article focuses on the new appointee's predecessor, but the reference to Solomon is

telling. The story of Solomon is frequently used to illustrate the power of innovative

thinking, as well as the value of maternal love. However, it carries with it an important

additional meaning: permanent separation. Nearly ten years before Cyprus was actually

---

[173] "Letter to the Editor 1 – No Title," *Irish Times*, February 25, 1964, 11.
[174] "Australian for 'Solomon' task in Cyprus," *Irish Independent*, January 15, 1964, 6.

partitioned, then, onlookers from a different continent saw in the island's future a biblically difficult decision between union and division.

To a great extent, the *Irish Times* trivialized the Cypriot ordeal. A 1959 article about the London-Zurich Agreements stated that the Greek and Turkish Cypriots were "natural enemies," and that "family quarrels are always the hardest to resolve."[175] This perception of the Cyprus disagreement persisted following *Kanli Noel*. By reducing the issue to something as simple as "ancient tensions," the paper helped perpetuate the fallacious notion that Greek and Turkish Cypriots are inherently at odds with each other. It is an especially interesting approach, though, given Ireland's history of religious violence; it is unlikely that the *Times* would appreciate similarly generalized reporting of its own country's history.

At the same time, the paper consistently argued that the 1960 constitution led to the 1964 outbreak of violence. Indeed, the *Times* repeatedly blamed ethnic violence on the misguided politics. In January 1964, it published the following: "[The Constitution] piled guarantee upon guarantee to the extent that the edifice was bound to keel over, leaving the two communities as far apart from each other as they had been in the first place."[176] Following the invasion, the *Times* also argued that national identity is expressed best through political institutions. This belief in the power of politics could provide a clue as to why it trivialized the Cypriot crisis by framing it ethnically: in doing so, the newspaper contextualized the conflict for its readers. For the *Times*, ethnic violence was the powder keg; political impotence was the spark.

---

[175] "In Agreement," *Irish Times*, February 20, 1959, 5.
[176] "Talking About Cyprus," *Irish Times*, January 15, 1964, 7.

The *Irish Independent*, by contrast, had a more sentimental view of the situation. It also, interestingly enough, provided readers with a great deal of information about Archbishop Makarios, UN Secretary General U Thant, and the island itself. The paper's decision to take this tactic reflects its belief that readers had little understanding of Mediterranean and international politics. In March 1964, the paper placed a regional map of Cyprus on the front page, with an accompanying arrow to identify the island's specific location.[177] A two-part feature piece on U Thant during that same month implies a curiosity about the UN and its leader. Moreover, its timing (during the formation of UNFICYP) suggests that the public had been receiving a great deal of information about the peacekeeping force, yet lacked a clear understanding of its greater implications or the daily duties of its overseer. The *Independent* used its coverage of the Cyprus conflict to combat this ignorance, and frequently brought in comparisons with Ireland. It compared the size of Cyprus to that of "the counties of Cork and Kerry put together,"[178] and referred to the Greek and Turkish Cypriots as "Orthodox" and "Moslems," respectively.[179] Similar religious undertones are present in several other articles, for this was the type of identification that resonated with the *Independent*'s readership. Indeed, the paper's affinity for Archbishop Makarios likely stemmed from his religious devotion, which the Irish would see as comfortable and familiar.

The *Independent*'s positive impression of the island persisted through the decades. It is often written into articles in a lamenting tone, as if the paper has a personal interest in preserving Cypriot peace:

---

[177] "Decision after day-long deliberation: Unit for Cyprus Agreed; Ireland's 'Yes' to U.N. request," *Irish Independent*, March 14, 1964, 1.
[178] Rushe, "The warmth and honesty of Makarios."
[179] Ibid.

> [Cyprus] is so abundant in Nature's gifts, so full of sunshine,
> so rich in the dazzling remnants of an ancient civilisation, so
> unspoiled by the excesses of modern commerce, so friendly in
> its people, so equipped to release the unhappiness and tension
> that afflicts the human race. It could be a veritable paradise, and
> all that stands between it and this supreme felicity is the folly of
> man.[180]

This sentimentality suggests that the paper's publishers (and readers) had an emotional

attachment to the island. The *Times*, by contrast, had what could be deemed a practical

attachment. As Prime Minister Eden had done, the *Times* tied the Cyprus problem to

ethnicity, and thus attempted to diminish its importance. When the 1974 war began, the

Independent attempted to analyze the mindsets of frustrated Greek Cypriots, suggesting

that it viewed many on the island as comrades in the same battle. "Part of the

fury…stems from their feeling of futility in the face of events. They, the majority, have

been deprived of part of the island…and no one seems to want to help."[181] The

Independent's considerate and respectful reporting is a departure from the factual,

political, and generalized *Times* articles. Reasons for these differences are numerous, but

they boil down to one: the writers have different agendas. The *Times*, a historically

unionist paper, would seek to quell the significance of the Cypriot conflict, and relegate

the inter communal tensions to "ancient" tensions. In doing this, it could distance the two

conflicts and stifle the resurgence of Irish memories of partition. In contrast, the

Independent was historically Irish nationalist: its authors recognized the similarities of

Cypriot and Irish inter communal violence, and wished to elevate the comparison. Doing

so might raise awareness in Ireland of the island's continued division; doing so could

perhaps bring about change.

---

[180] Ibid.
[181] "Futile killing," *Irish Independent*, August 20, 1974, 6.

Conclusions

By comparing both newspapers, it has been possible to highlight the long lasting, although not always immediately evident, effects of partition. Analysis of foreign commentary offers a unique lens through which to view a regional conflict: Irish reporters had opinions on Cyprus, but they also implanted their own national remorse onto the Mediterranean island's problem. Many consider the "Cyprus problem" to be a frozen and forgotten conflict; in doing so, they downgrade the long-term effects of partition. By looking at partition through the eyes of the Irish, I illustrate the camaraderie that emerges when two countries undergo this experience. It is something citizens of a non-divided country would have difficulty comprehending. By the time Cyprus underwent its first post-independence bout of inter communal violence, Ireland had been divided for nearly half a century. Many of its reporters had been alive at the time, and were able to bring sophistication and understanding to their articles. By studying two politically opposite newspapers, I illustrate that, despite their differences, Irish reporters were often painfully aware of the process of partition.

The *Irish Times* and *Irish Independent* reports on Cyprus varied in depth, angle, and compassion. The *Times* presented dispassionate and practical analyses of the situation, but the *Independent* went overboard to encourage readers to understand the conflict on a personal level. In this case, the *Independent* likely did so to remind readers that inter communal violence is a deeply personal issue, one that cannot be relegated to simply facts or statistics. Yet, noteworthy similarities outweigh these differences. Each paper criticized British policy towards Cyprus, particularly with regards to the 1960 treaties of independence. Following *Kanli Noel*, mentions of British blame slowly disappeared as partition took center stage. Both papers immediately recognized the

similarities between Cyprus and Ireland (the *Times* did so in a pre-independence, 1959 article[182]) and both quickly moved to denounce any suggestion of partition in the Mediterranean.

Nearly a half century following Irish partition, it is still possible to trace resentment between the lines of each newspaper. Their motives may be different, but this is certain. In Ireland, partition was used as a "'problem-solving' device adopted in an attempt to meet the claims of conflicting political aspirations."[183] Resentment lingered and colored sentiments during the Cyprus crisis. In Cyprus, unlike in Ireland, partition was imposed from the outside. This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the invasion; Cypriots' memories, like the Irish, remain tainted with anger and frustration. Both situations illustrate the futility of long-term partition. Permanent separation – particularly in a society like Cyprus, where ancestral land holds great significance[184] – fails to get at the root of the problem. The result is continued tainted political opinions and bitterness.

---

[182] "Division in Cyprus," *Irish Times*, July 27, 1959.
[183] T.G. Fraser, *Partition in Ireland, India and Palestine: Theory and Practice* (Hong Kong: Macmillan Press, 1984), 2.
[184] Helena Smith, "International: Cyprus: Scent of victory among the lemon trees as displaced Cypriots win claim on ancestral land: Islanders who fled Turks in 1974 hail landmark court ruling on property rights," *The Guardian,* May 2, 2009, 29.

Conclusion

For the past two thousand years, external interference has been the go-to foreign policy. Interference means involvement, involvement means a seat at the table, a seat at the table means power. The colonial era offers perhaps the best illustration of this concept, for outside powers grafted themselves onto a foreign region's domestic political and cultural life. In the twentieth century, this type of policy remained but it became slightly more conniving. After the Second World War, the Marshall Plan simultaneously revived and Americanized European economies. Without overtly colonizing, the United States spread its influence to the far corners of the world. In the more recent past, interference has taken the form of a non-state actor: the presence of the United Nations in Bosnia during the last years of the twentieth century, for example. It can also be a force for humanitarianism: in the wake of reports that Syrian President Bashar al-Assad used chemical weapons on his own people, many in the international community began pressuring their governments to intervene in the civil war. For the purposes of this project, though, intervention is a harmful policy that detracts from autonomy and inhibits economic and cultural development.

The English have spent the past five centuries on Ireland trying to capture, control, and confine it. When the island was partitioned in the 1920s, many thought the struggle had come to a close. But, centuries of English domination meant that there were pockets of English loyalists who continued to live in Ireland. In the subsequent decades, then, conflict erupted between English loyalists and Irish nationalists in the north of Ireland. In Cyprus, foreign rule has been the way of life for nearly two millennia.

Venetians, Egyptians, Ottomans, Romans, English. They all wanted Cyprus. Its neat

placement in the eastern corner of the Mediterranean meant that whoever controlled it

controlled sea access between Europe and the Middle East. In 1960, the Cypriot

constitution heralded the end of colonialism and the creation of something new. It

legitimized intervention by, not one and not two, but three foreign powers. The Greeks

and Turks now had just as much a right to intervene in Cyprus as did the English.

Greece's coup and Turkey's invasion in 1974, though, revealed almost comically how

terribly misguided the constitution had been. International interference can have positive

results, but in the long run it degrades local authority, which can have disastrous

implications on nationalism, and economic and cultural traditions.

In the most theoretical part of this project I discussed how a country divides.

Social scientists such as Robert Schaeffer have noticed two trends: former British

colonies split according to ethnic divisions, and Cold War states split according to

political divisions. This is overwhelmingly true, but we must be careful when discussing

partitions. There is an unavoidable tendency to mention ethnic divisions in the same

breath as intractable, ancient, and unpreventable differences. The idea that people cannot

live together because of religious or ethnic variations is an old one, but it is one that I

wanted to explore in the context of Ireland and Cyprus. As the Irish narrative goes,

Catholics and Protestants cannot stand each other. But, this is not the product of inherent

hatred. It is, rather, the product of foreign (British) involvement, and continuing

displacement and segregation. In an attempt to make Ireland a Protestant stronghold,

English monarchs encouraged and forced migration to their western neighbor. The

Protestants chafed under the restrictive relationship with their English kings and queens,

but they acquiesced. Over the years, they began to represent the oppressor to the Catholic oppressed. Political tensions such as these affected relationships on the tiny island, and tainted inter communal friendships until the present-day. In Cyprus, the situation is remarkably similar. Since Ottoman Muslims arrived on the island in 1571, policies by foreign rulers kept them separate from the native Greek community. Following inter communal violence in 1963, Turkish Cypriot leaders (with Turkish support) formed enclaves to protect their people. In both countries, it has been foreign powers that have discouraged local unity. This has meant they have a seat at the table for inter communal talks. And, as we know, a seat at the table means power.

I wrote earlier that partition is, at its heart, a local matter. This becomes overwhelmingly and painfully apparent when reading the stories of those who have been displaced. Reports by Turkish Cypriots who, returning to their homes after forty years, found nothing but dirt; memories of Greek Cypriots who visited their old homes in the north and found them in disrepair. External actors will come and go, their motives will shift suspiciously, but the local population has an unshakable memory. Partition disrupts the local order. In both Ireland and Cyprus, one's identity is heavily associated with one's land; property is personal. The forced migration that follows partition, then, devastates morale. There is also the fact that newly constructed borders enforce and maintain both partition and migration. For many Irish and Cypriots, borders serve as both visible and invisible symbols of partition. They form a physical and mental barrier to reconciliation.

In kindergarten classes, teachers punish students for fighting by placing them in opposite corners. In a sense, partition is grounded in the same theory: temporary division

for permanent stability. But, it rarely works out that way. In the past hundred years, Germany, India, Palestine, Cyprus, Ireland, and more have been divided. Of these, few have been reunited. For the others, frequent flare-ups or frozen dialogue has been their punishment. And yet, people continue to discuss partition as though it is a viable option. Media and political commentators heighten ethnic rivalry and portray it as ancient and unfixable. Foreign actors continue to insert themselves into domestic conflicts, negating any purported respect for sovereignty, autonomy, and the will of the people. Partition does not work. It cannot work as long as its basic premise is the political, cultural, and economic separation of two communities. Partition wrenches communities apart and heightens inter communal tensions; politicians and diplomats must stop using it as the fail-safe option to ending strife. It will never succeed.

Bibliography

Archives
Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

United Nations Archives

Periodicals
ABCNews (2013)

Al Jazeera America (2014)

Financial Times (2007)

Irish Independent (1960-1974)

Irish Times (1959-1974)

Los Angeles Times (2001)

Smithsonian Magazine (2009)

The Atlanta Journal (1997)

The Globe and Mail (1973)

The Guardian (2009-2012)

The Washington Post, Times Herald (1967)

Secondary Sources
Attalides, Michael. *Cyprus: Nationalism and international politics*. New York: St.
        Martin's Press, 1979.

Bryant, Rebecca. "An Aesthetics of Self: Moral Remaking and Cypriot Education."
        Comparative Studies in Society and History 43 (July 2001): 583-614.

Bryant, Rebecca. *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Strife.
        Report Two. Life Stories: Turkish Cypriot Community*. Peace Research Institute
        Oslo (PRIO), 2012. Accessed March 13, 2014. http://www.prio-cyprus-
        displacement.net/images/users/1/Report%202-%20R.BRYANT%20ENG-
        WEB.pdf.

Bryant, Rebecca and Mete Hatay. "Guns and Guitars: Simulating Sovereignty in a state
        of siege." *American Ethnologist* (2011): 631-649. Accessed July 4, 2013. doi:
        10.1111/j.1548-1425.2011.01327.x

CIA Factbook. "Kenya." Accessed December 30, 2013,
        https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ke.html

Delaney, Frank. *Ireland: A Novel*. London: TimeWarner Books, 2004.

Demetriou, Olga. *Displacement in Cyprus: Consequences of Civil and Military Strife.*
        Report Two. Life Stories: Greek Cypriot Community. Peace Research Institute
        Oslo (PRIO), 2012. Accessed March 19, 2014. http://www.prio-cyprus-
        displacement.net/images/users/1/Report%201-
        %20O.DEMETRIOU%20ENG.WEB.pdf.

Democracy and Development Platform Association (DEKAP) and Eastern Mediterranean
        University Centre for Strategic Studies (DAÜ-SAM). *Restrictions, Isolations and*
        Vendettas: The Lot of the Turkish Cypriots Since 1963. Lefkosa Mersin 10
        Turkey: DEKAP and DAÜ-SAM, 2007.

Fallon, Joseph E. "Ireland: Two states, two nations." *World Affairs* 158.2 (Fall 1995): 71-
        79. Accessed January 3, 2014.

Foster, R.F. *Modern Ireland: 1600-1972*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Fox, Margalit. "Seamus Heaney, Irish Poet of Soil and Strife, Dies at 74." *The New York*
        Times, August 30, 2013. Accessed March 6, 2014.
        http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/31/arts/seamus-heaney-acclaimed-irish-poet-
        dies-at-74.html?pagewanted=all.

Fraser, T.G. *Partition in Ireland, India and Palestine: Theory and Practice*. Hong Kong:
        Macmillan Press, 1984.

Global IDP Database. "Profile of Internal Displacement: Cyprus." Last modified April
        27, 2005. http://www.internal-
        displacement.org/assets/library/Europe/Cyprus/pdf/Cyprus-April-2005-2.pdf.

Greece's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Treaty No. 5476. United Kingdom of Great
        Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece and Turkey and Cyprus." Accessed October
        30, 2013. http://www.mfa.gr/images/docs/kypriako/treaty_of_establishment.pdf.

Gregory, Ian N., Niall A. Cunningham, C.D. Lloyd, Ian G. Shuttleworth, Paul S. Ell.
        "Continuous Division, 1920s-1960s." In *Troubled Geographies: A Spatial History*
        of Religion and Society in Ireland. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.
        Accessed March 13, 2014, http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/troubledgeogs/chap7.htm.

Henn, Brigadier Francis. *A Business of Some Heat: The United Nations Force in Cyprus*
        Before and During the 1974 Invasion. Great Britain: Pen & Sword Books, Ltd.,
        2004.

Hitchens, Christopher. *Cyprus*. London: Quarter Books Limited, 1984.

Hollis III, Daniel Webster. *The Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations: The History of Ireland*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Kellenberger, Jakob. "The ICRC's response to internal displacement: strengths, challenges and constraints." *International Review of the Red Cross* 91 (2009): 475-490. Accessed September 19, 2013.

Ker-Lindsay, James. "Shifting Alignments: The External Orientations of Cyprus since Independence." *The Cyprus Review* 22.2 (Fall 2010): 67-74.

Khazaleh, Lorenz. "Strong feelings, mystical rituals and equivocal messages." Translated by Matthew Whiting. Accessed March 5, 2014, https://www.uio.no/english/research/interfaculty-research-areas/culcom/news/2005/flags-identity-summary.html.

Maass, Peter. *Love Thy Neighbor: A Story of War*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996.

McCabe, Zachary E. "Northern Ireland: The Paramilitaries, Terrorism, and September 11th." *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* Vol. 30, Issue 4 (2001-2002): 547-573.

Moody, T.W. and F.X. Martin, eds. *The Course of Irish History*. Cork: Mercier Press, 2011.

Neumann, Franz L. "Soviet Policy in Germany." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 263 (May 1949): 165-179.

O'Brien, Mark. *The Irish Times: A History*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008.

O'Malley, Brendan and Ian Craig. *The Cyprus Conspiracy*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 1999.

Pogany, Istvan. "Could the UN Keep the Peace in Northern Ireland?" *The World Today* 37 (July-August 1981): 293-7. Accessed March 4, 2014. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40395493

Presidency of the Republic of Cyprus. "Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus." Accessed March 6, 2014. http://www.presidency.gov.cy/presidency/presidency.nsf/all/1003AEDD83EED9C7C225756F0023C6AD/$file/CY_Constitution.pdf.

Salih, Halil Ibrahim. *Cyprus: The Impact of Diverse Nationalism on a State*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1978.

Schaeffer, Robert. *Warpaths: The Politics of Partition.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1990.

Sert, Deniz. "Property rights in return and resettlement of internally displaced persons (IDPs): A quantitative and comparative case study." PhD diss., City University of New York, 2008.

UN Peacemaker. "No. 5712: Greece, Turkey and Cyprus Treaty of Alliance (with Additional Protocols)." Accessed February 2, 2014. http://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/CY%20GR%20TR_600816_Treaty%20of%20Alliance%20(with%20additionnal%20protocols).pdf.

Yakinthou, Christalla. *Political Settlements in Divided Societies: Consociationalism and Cyprus*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.